

Evaluation of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces in California

Final Report of
The California State University,
Sacramento



July 2003

Evaluation, Monitoring and
Audits Division

Gray Davis
Governor

Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning

O
C
J
P

CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, SACRAMENTO



EVALUATION OF MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES IN CALIFORNIA

**CONDUCTED FOR
CALIFORNIA OFFICE OF CRIMINAL JUSTICE PLANNING**

MIKI VOHRYZEK-BOLDEN, PH.D., CSU SACRAMENTO, CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
YVETTE FARMER, PH.D., CSU SACRAMENTO, CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
WILL VIZZARD, D.P.A., CSU SACRAMENTO, CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
TIM CAPRON, PH.D., CSU SACRAMENTO, CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
SUE COTE, J.D., PH.D., CSU SACRAMENTO, CRIMINAL JUSTICE DIVISION
VICKII CASTILLON, MA, CSU SACRAMENTO, OFFICE OF INSTITUTIONAL RESEARCH
TAMRA JONES, MA STUDENT, CSU SACRAMENTO, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
JULIANE MORA, MA STUDENT, CSU SACRAMENTO, DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNICATION STUDIES
SOPHIA MONROY, MPA STUDENT, CSU STANISLAUS, DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION
BEN KOBRIN, MBA STUDENT, CSU SACRAMENTO, COLLEGE OF BUSINESS ADMINISTRATION

JULY 2003

The opinions, findings, and conclusions in this publication are those of the author and not necessarily those of OCJP. Additional copies of this document can be obtained by contacting the Office of Criminal Justice Planning at (916) 324-9100. Material contained in this publication is in the public domain and may be reproduced, fully or partially, without the permission of the State of California. The courtesy of source credit is requested.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The evaluation team at California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) wish to express their appreciation for the tremendous support and assistance provided by Kirby Everhart, Interim Chief, Evaluation, Monitoring and Audits Division and John Isaacson, Chief, Drug Enforcement Branch of the California Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP). These individuals facilitated the research evaluation process by providing access to data maintained by OCJP and notifying the Byrne-funded multi-jurisdictional drug task forces (MJTF) of the evaluation and the need for their assistance and cooperation.

We also wish to thank all of the personnel from the 59 MJTFs who attended the focus group meetings and participated in the on-site interviews. Their observations, insights, and recommendations for the operation and improvement of these MJTFs were key to the evaluation process. The completion of this evaluation could not have been done without the assistance from OCJP staff and the task force members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>PAGE</u>
<u>LIST OF TABLES</u>	ii
<u>EXECUTIVE SUMMARY</u>	iii
<u>INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND</u>	1
<u>METHODOLOGY</u>	4
<u>DATA SOURCES</u>	4
<u>FINDINGS</u>	10
<u>WERE GRANT OBJECTIVES ACHIEVED?</u>	10
<u>DID THE PROGRAM ELEMENTS WORK?</u>	21
<u>WERE THE FUNDS SPENT EFFICIENTLY?</u>	35
<u>WAS THE INTENDED PROBLEM ADDRESSED?</u>	37
<u>WHAT LESSONS WERE LEARNED FOR OTHER AGENCIES?</u>	39
<u>FURTHER FINDINGS</u>	49
<u>TASK FORCE FEATURES THAT CONTRIBUTE TO EFFECTIVE COOPERATION AND COORDINATION</u>	49
<u>UNINTENDED CONSEQUENCES</u>	52
<u>RECOMMENDATIONS</u>	54
<u>CLOSING REMARKS</u>	62
<u>APPENDIX 1: EDWARD BYRNE FORMULA GRANT AUTHORIZED PROGRAM PURPOSE AREAS</u> ..	64
<u>APPENDIX 2: CHART 1: PROGRAM CHARACTERISTICS OF MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES</u>	70
<u>APPENDIX 3: MJTF EVALUATION 2003 - CODING INSTRUCTIONS FOR DATA ENTRY FORM</u> ..	79
<u>APPENDIX 4: MJTF INTERVIEW SCHEDULE</u>	90
<u>APPENDIX 5: CONSENSUS ON CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR SUCCESS FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL TASK FORCES</u>	96
<u>APPENDIX 6: CHART 2: MAJOR MJTF RECOMMENDATIONS BASED ON FOCUS GROUP MEETINGS, PROGRESS REPORT DATA AND ON-SITE INTERVIEWS</u>	99

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>PAGE</u>
1. ARRESTS, PROSECUTIONS, AND CONVICTIONS BY FISCAL YEAR FOR MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES	11
2. NUMBER OF PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE SEARCHES BY FISCAL YEAR FOR CALIFORNIA MULTI-JURISDICTIONAL DRUG TASK FORCES.....	12
3. NUMBER OF PROBATION REVOCATIONS BY FISCAL YEAR.....	13
4. NUMBER OF WEAPONS SEIZED BY FISCAL YEAR.....	14
5. NUMBER OF ASSET SEIZURES BY FISCAL YEAR	14
6. VALUE OF ASSETS SEIZED BY FISCAL YEAR.....	14
7. NUMBER OF DRUG LABS SEIZED OR DISMANTLED BY FISCAL YEAR.....	15
8. NUMBER OF MARIJUANA AREAS ERADICATED BY FISCAL YEAR.....	17
9. TOTAL AMOUNT OF DRUGS SEIZED BY MEASURE FY 1999 – FY 2001.....	19
10. AMOUNT OF GRANT AWARD, MONIES EXPENDED, AND GRANT BALANCES BY FISCAL YEAR	33

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is an evaluation of the multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) in California awarded funds through the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program (Byrne). These task forces fall within Byrne Grant Program purpose area 2: Multi-jurisdictional task force programs that integrate federal, state, and/or local drug law enforcement agencies and prosecutors for the purpose of enhancing interagency coordination and intelligence and facilitating multi-jurisdictional investigations. There were 59 MJTFs representing 57 California counties that were the focus of this evaluation.

This report provides a brief background on the Byrne program and the projects that received funding through this federal grant program. The evaluation employed both quantitative and qualitative measures to evaluate the MJTFs over three fiscal years: 1999-2000; 2000-2001; and 2001-2002. There were three phases to the data collection process. In the first and second phases, evaluators examined final progress reports submitted to the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP) and conducted five focus group meetings with task force commanders throughout California. In the third phase, evaluators conducted on-site interviews with members of eleven task forces that represented different regions in the state and had some unique features that had the potential for replication.

This report addresses the five questions specified by the Legislative Analyst Office as criteria for all OCJP evaluations.

1. Were the grant objectives achieved?

Yes, task forces, whose members include representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, and probation agencies, met the grant objectives by coordinating efforts to reduce the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers. They arrested 42,122 suspects, prosecuted 24,604 offenders, and convicted 20,685 offenders. The MJTFs prepared between 2,400 and 2,600 search warrants each fiscal year and conducted 17,236 probation and/or parole searches during the three-year evaluation period. Task force members also conducted 5,446 probation revocation hearings, seized 7,657 weapons and 884 other items that had been obtained by offenders as a result of illegal activities. The estimated value of all assets seized was \$26,457,556. They seized 3,482 drug labs and eradicated 254 marijuana areas. The drugs seized included 129 million grams of marijuana, 1.17 million grams of cocaine, and 1.17 million grams of the methamphetamine precursor drug ephedrine.

2. Did the program elements work?

Yes, effective program elements provide the foundation for several best practices currently used by the MJTFs and identified in the course of this evaluation. These best practices include but are not limited to the following: vertical prosecution; prosecutorial involvement in the review of search warrant affidavits and complaints; intensive probation supervision; administrative leadership; co-location of task force members; drug buys; jointly-investigated cases; aggressive asset forfeiture investigations; and joint training sessions. Other activities documenting that the program elements worked were the use of coordinated probation searches and social service personnel to work with drug endangered children. These MJTF activities enhanced interagency cooperation, increased agency coordination and specialized investigations, and allowed funding of narcotics enforcement activities that otherwise would not have been performed.

3. Were the funds spent efficiently?

Yes, the MJTFs utilize Byrne funds and local expertise to identify and target the highest priority drug enforcement problems in their respective counties. Such a model produces innate efficiencies through low overhead and effective targeting. Funds were used to purchase needed surveillance equipment and provide for the salary of task force members who conduct specialized drug enforcement activities. In several smaller jurisdictions, these funds made possible a specialized drug enforcement effort where no such activity would otherwise exist. Ninety-four percent of the grant funds were expended over the three-year evaluation period.

4. Was the intended problem addressed?

Yes, task forces coordinated the efforts of law enforcement, prosecution, and probation agencies to reduce the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers. Prosecutors aggressively pursued conviction of targeted drug offenders, probation officers with reduced and specialized caseloads closely monitored selected offenders and participated in searches, co-located personnel shared information and enhanced intelligence gathering, aggressive asset forfeiture investigators and managers increased forfeitures, and funded canine units increased narcotics seizures. Finally, establishing a working relationship with Child Protective Services or developing a Drug Endangered Children program enhanced the ability of the MJTFs to address the drug problem in a more holistic manner by recognizing the risk posed to children by illegal drug activities.

5. What lessons were learned for other agencies?

MJTFs learned several lessons that would benefit other agencies. Drug enforcement efforts benefit from multi-jurisdictional teams that include personnel from law enforcement, prosecution, probation, and social and health service agencies. Regular communication among these participants creates good working relationships that can

result in reducing the availability of drugs in their jurisdictions. These collaborative efforts must recognize the potential problem of staff turnover and insufficient numbers of interested and qualified personnel due to staff shortages within the member agencies. Joint training is vital and should be conducted on a regular basis. Finally, prosecutorial involvement in the review of search warrant affidavits and complaints and vertical prosecution of drug cases is an essential component of any effort to enforce drug laws and reduce violent crime.

Recommendations

Although the task forces are successful in meeting the grant objectives, the CSUS evaluation team make several recommendations that address how the Byrne-funded multi-jurisdictional drug task forces can improve their program. Data for these recommendations come from the analysis of task force progress reports, focus group meetings, and on-site interviews with MJTF personnel. The recommendations for OCJP are as follows:

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1. MJTF Policy and Procedures Manual | 7. Staggered Staff Rotation |
| 2. Co-location of Task Force Members | 8. Field Training Program |
| 3. Team Involvement in Task Force Member Selection | 9. Regularly Scheduled MJTF Meetings |
| 4. Probation and Parole Officer on MJTF | 10. On-going Training of MJTF Members |
| 5. Asset Forfeiture Staff Member on MJTF | 11. MJTF Computer Terminal |
| 6. Administrative Assistant for Each Task Force | 12. Vertical Prosecution |
| | 13. Standardized Progress Report Form |
| | 14. Annual Review of Budget Allocation |
| | 15. Maintain Continuing Agency Commitment to MJTF |

The MJTFs in California have utilized the Byrne funds to accomplish the goals of the Anti-Drug Abuse program. These funds are specifically used to enhance task force participation and coordination between county agencies in an effort to provide comprehensive drug enforcement within their respective jurisdictions. The Byrne funds have provided these task forces with resources to develop or expand processes and procedures to monitor known drug offenders and to incapacitate drug traffickers.

INTRODUCTION AND BACKGROUND

The Governor's Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP), as the State Administrative Agency (SAA), is responsible for the evaluation of programs and projects funded through the Edward Byrne Memorial State and Local Law Enforcement Assistance Formula Grant Program (Byrne). The majority of the Byrne funds were distributed in non-competitive grants issued through the Anti-Drug Abuse (ADA) Enforcement Program. Initiated by the federal government in the Anti-Drug Abuse Acts of 1986 and 1988, the ADA is designed, in part, to assist state and local agencies to enforce laws dealing with drug use and violent crime.

In California, each county, as a requirement for receiving Byrne funds through the ADA program, must submit a grant application that includes a comprehensive plan describing the drug and/or violent crime problems in its jurisdiction, as well as efforts and projected resources needed to address those problems. The plan is to be developed by a steering committee composed of the county sheriff, district attorney, chief probation officer, county drug administrator, and all chiefs of police in the county. The steering committee must also identify which of the 29 Byrne Grant Fund Program purpose areas (see Appendix 1) to implement in order to respond to the identified drug and violent crime problem in its communities.

The focus of this evaluation is on the multi-jurisdictional task forces (MJTF) awarded funds through the ADA program. These task forces fall within the Byrne Grant Program purpose area number 2: Multi-jurisdictional task force programs that integrate federal, state, and/or local drug law enforcement agencies and prosecutors for the purpose of enhancing interagency coordination and intelligence and facilitating multi-jurisdictional investigations. In an effort to accomplish these goals, OCJP mandates that each drug enforcement task force adopt the following project goal: reduce illegal activities of targeted

offenders (serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers) through law enforcement, prosecution, and probation efforts.

There were 59 MJTFs representing 57 California counties that were the focus of this evaluation. The Byrne-funded project in San Mateo is a Drug Court and not within the scope of this evaluation. Three of the five Byrne-funded projects in Los Angeles County are included in this evaluation. As Chart 1: *Program Characteristics of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces* shows (see Appendix 2), there are many similarities between the projects in terms of participating agencies, focus of task force, and key program characteristics.

The selection and participation of partners on the drug task forces are related to the identified drug problem in their respective jurisdictions. Task forces involved the sheriff, district attorney, and chief probation officer. Forty-nine of the task forces included membership from their respective police departments and/or police association. The California Highway Patrol (CHP) was a partner on 24 task forces and the Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE) was a participating agency on 16 of the task forces. Other participating agencies included: California Department of Justice; County Drug and Alcohol Administrator; Mental Health; Court Administrator; County Health Services; County Department of Education; United States Forest Service; Bureau of Land Management; Department of Corrections; Superior Court; Community College Police; General Hospital; and Child Welfare Services.

The general focus of the task forces' activities was identifying, apprehending, prosecuting, and convicting drug traffickers and manufacturers. Each MJTF then directed its efforts in terms of their perceived drug problem. Specific activities included, among others:

interdicting the flow of drugs and drug funds on major transportation highways, disruption and investigation of sales of narcotics to children and young adults,

dismantling of clandestine methamphetamine labs and eradication of marijuana cultivation,
intensive drug prosecution of major drug manufacturers and dealers,
provision of narcotics-related support to local community-oriented policing efforts,
reducing conspicuous street-level narcotics trafficking through surveillance, intelligence gathering, buy and sell busts, and warrants,
interdiction of drug flows at a major airport facility,
suppression of gang-related violence,
arrest and prosecution of gang-related cocaine and methamphetamine distributors, reducing existing narcotics distribution, and
targeting high-level drug trafficking enterprises and money laundering.

One of the key program characteristics was vertical prosecution. As will be discussed later, this particular program feature was identified by the Federal Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) as one of the critical elements that lead to successful accomplishment of both programmatic and organizational objectives of MJTFs. Many task forces also use the services of the district attorney's office in the review of search warrant affidavits and complaints.

Other key program characteristics described in the chart include co-location of some or all of the task force members; intensive probation supervision; multi-county task force; civil abatement and crime prevention; focus on illegal drug sales in low income areas and on school grounds; reducing economic incentive for drug trafficking; non-grant funded overtime for evening, weekend, and random surveillance and searches; use of forensic laboratory personnel in dismantling of methamphetamine labs; canine (K-9) services; coordination with other-funded drug task forces; focus on drug endangered children; and services of probation drug specialist to monitor targeted offenders. The data document the use of multiple strategies across the state to address the drug problem within each jurisdiction.

METHODOLOGY

Qualitative and quantitative approaches to the evaluation were used. Both approaches are necessary when assessing inter-agency coordination efforts. They are used in a complementary fashion where the quantitative data provide specific outcome measures on those aspects of the projects that are quantifiable and the qualitative measurement provide a holistic view of the coordination effort. The primary sources of information for this report include data from final progress reports, operational agreements, focus group meetings, and on-site interviews with personnel from eleven MJTFs.

Data Sources

Final Progress Reports

Multi-jurisdictional drug enforcement task forces submit three progress reports to the OCJP throughout the grant year. The first two reports cover three months of task force activities and the final report combines this data with the final six months of activities for the grant year. Final progress report data for 1999-2000, 2000-2001, and 2001-2002 were used in this evaluation.

Task force activities are reported in both numerical and narrative form. The numerical data were coded and then entered into a database for analysis. Numerical data included such information as reported arrests, number of prosecutions and convictions, number of probation searches, and amount of illegal drugs seized. Variables were generated from this information (see Appendix 3 for the coding instrument). Narrative data was also analyzed for the identification of best practices, challenges to effective coordination, and lessons learned.

Operational Agreements

OCJP, under grant authority, requires each task force to have an Operational Agreement (OA) or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). The elements that were common to these documents were as follows: 1) goals for the task force; 2) list of participating agencies and their responsibilities; 3) policies and procedures pertaining to the organization and operation of the task force; 4) plan for the distribution of forfeited assets; and 5) signatures indicating an agency's commitment to participate in task force activities under the terms and conditions set forth in the OA.

Focus Group Meetings

Group meetings with task force commanders were held in five locations throughout the state: Sacramento, Redding, San Jose, Fresno, and Riverside. The Office of Criminal Justice Planning sent all project directors and/or narcotics task force commanders a letter on December 19, 2002 stating that these meetings were mandatory for all OCJP Drug Control Project recipients. At the beginning of the meetings, researchers explained the purpose of the research, assured anonymity of responses, and indicated that all information gleaned from the meetings would be aggregated in the final report.

Participants were asked to respond and discuss the following four questions: 1) Who are the key participants in your task force and what role do they play? 2) What are the key strengths and weaknesses of your task force? 3) How does the existence of the task force change things in your jurisdiction and for whom? and 4) What lessons have you learned that could benefit another task force? Where appropriate, research staff asked probing questions that provided greater clarity and understanding of the responses.

The group interviews provided us with the opportunity to collect data in an open-ended narrative without attempting to fit program activities or people's experiences into

predetermined, standardized categories. This qualitative approach allowed the evaluators to look at the selected MJTFs holistically, thus providing richly detailed information about these projects as they occur in the real world.

On-Site Interviews

At the completion of the focus group meetings and the analysis of the data contained in the MJTF progress reports for the three fiscal years, researchers developed an interview schedule (see Appendix 4) that would provide additional information and data on the best practices and lessons learned by the task forces. Many questions were also designed to clarify and provide further understanding of some of our initial findings.

In consultation with the Drug Enforcement Branch of the OCJP, eleven MJTFs were selected for the more intensive on-site interviews. A pre-test of the interview instrument was conducted in one MJTF jurisdiction and modifications were made to the instrument based on the pre-test. Anonymity and confidentiality of the individual responses from these task force members was assured for all respondents.

The selection of the task forces was based on the following factors: regional representation; mix of urban, suburban, and rural areas; focus of task force; jurisdictions that collectively account for more than 60 percent of the crime in California; and unique characteristics that may be easily replicated. The specific task force members interviewed varied by site. The research team requested interviews with individuals who represent the following agency or organization: sheriff; district attorney; police department(s); probation; steering committee member; and other (e.g., California Highway Patrol (CHP), parole agent, or California Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE)).

There were a total of 62 individuals interviewed at the eleven task force sites. Of these 62 individuals, 23 represented local law enforcement (i.e., police or sheriff), 10 assistant

district attorneys, 11 probation officers, 11 task force commanders, 3 steering committee members, and four individuals representing other partner agencies (e.g., parole, CHP).

Researchers introduced themselves to the individual respondents and indicated that they were part of a California State University, Sacramento (CSUS) evaluation team working with OCJP. Respondents were told that the questions were designed to provide a better understanding about what works and what may not work for drug task forces. Most if not all respondents were asked a few introductory questions including how long the task force had been in operation, the number of individuals currently serving on the task force by classification, and to describe how the task force operates in their jurisdiction.

Interviewers also asked all respondents to answer ten general questions and then asked task force commanders, steering committee members, law enforcement representatives, probation, and other task force participants to respond to specific questions as appropriate.

The questions asked of all respondents were:

What are three key features of your task force that you believe contribute to effective cooperation and coordination?

Are there any other features or practices that you believe are also significant?

Are the task force priorities and focus appropriate to the drug problem in this county?

If the drug task force ceased to exist tomorrow, what would happen to drug enforcement in the county?

Are there other drug task forces that operate in your jurisdiction? If yes, how do you interact and/or work with these task forces?

Do you as a task force member participate in regularly scheduled meetings? If yes, how often and with whom? What is gained from these meetings?

Do you participate in joint training with other members of the task force? If yes, describe type, participants, and frequency.

What are some of the unintended consequences of your task force activities?

What challenges hinder your ability to reach higher levels of effectiveness? and

If you were to advise another county who is setting up a drug task force, what have you learned that you would share with them?

Task force commanders were asked:

What role do you play in the selection and hiring of new task force members?
Do you have any problems with frequent turnover in task force staffing?

Does the steering committee periodically review the allocation of grant resources? If no, do you believe it would be useful for the steering committee to consider this? If yes, have they ever changed the allocation formula in response to changing needs or circumstances in your jurisdiction? and
Are you consulted in the event of any allocation changes?

Steering committee members were asked:

How often does your steering committee meet and what is the nature of their discussions? and
Does the steering committee periodically review the allocation of grant resources? If yes, have you ever changed the allocation formula in response to changing needs or circumstances in your jurisdiction?

Law enforcement representatives were asked:

Is the nature of drug enforcement investigations changing? If yes, how and why?
The data indicate a drop in the number of investigations initiated between 1999 and 2002? Have you experienced this in your jurisdiction? If yes, please explain.
The data also showed a decrease in the number of methamphetamine labs dismantled.
Can you explain this finding for us?
How do you handle deconfliction? and
Do task force members have access to each other's databases? If no, how you do access information regarding potential suspects?

Prosecutorial representatives were asked:

What practices or procedures facilitate successful prosecution and conviction of MJTF cases?
Do you review all search warrants and complaints prior to judicial review? If no, what proportion of search warrants and/or complaints do you review? and
Has judicial practice changed in your jurisdiction between 1999 and 2002 in terms of the imposition of prison sentences for drug convictions?

Probation officers were asked:

What proportion of your time is spent on task force activities?
Describe the role and/or kind of assistance you provide to the task force;
What are the advantages and disadvantages of the way you participate on the task force? and
Have there been any legal (statutory or case law) and/or departmental changes in policies and procedures regarding probation revocations between 1999 and 2002? If yes, please describe these changes.

Other task force participants (e.g., asset forfeiture specialist) were asked:

What proportion of your time is spent on task force activities?
Describe the role and/or kind of assistance you provide to the task force? and
What are the advantages and disadvantages of the way you participate on the task force?

The findings from all three research activities are described and discussed in the next sections of the report. It is important to recognize that because our on-site interviews were limited to eleven sites, certain data reported will pertain only to these locations. This does not, however, suggest the non-existence of such policies, procedures, and practices in the other 48 MJTFs that were the focus of the overall evaluation.

FINDINGS

The Legislative Analyst Office (LAO) identified five questions that must be addressed in all OCJP evaluations: Were grant objectives achieved? Did the program elements work? Were the funds spent efficiently? Was the intended problem addressed? and What lessons were learned for other agencies? These questions will serve as the framework for describing our evaluation findings.

Were Grant Objectives Achieved?

Task forces, whose members include representatives from law enforcement, prosecution, and probation agencies, coordinate efforts to reduce the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers. The goal of reducing such activities is primarily accomplished through the execution of three tasks: arrest, prosecution, and conviction of targeted offenders.

Gathering data on task force investigations proved to be somewhat challenging. However, we learned during the on-site interviews that quality investigations are possible because of the MJTFs access to staff resources and specialized equipment (e.g., surveillance van, K-9). In many instances, these investigations extended over long periods and used extensive investigative resources to strengthen cases involving complex trafficking networks composed of multiple suspects.

As many respondents stated, the quality of the investigation directly influences their ability to effectuate an arrest and process the case through the criminal justice system. And as further noted by respondents, the nature of investigations has changed over the last several years because the drug traffickers/suppliers are getting ‘smarter’ and more educated about the drug enforcement efforts in the counties. One statement made by a

respondent illustrates this point: “When people are arrested, they become educated by the system. They see how the investigation worked against them, they see the search warrants, they go to jail (‘a classroom for crooks’), and when they get out, they know not to make the same mistakes.” This then requires task force members to become smarter and develop new and creative methods to investigate drug offenders, which may require extensive use of alternative strategies (e.g., wiretaps). Another respondent indicated that the general investigative process is the same, but in some cases, task forces have expanded the scope of their investigations to include drug endangered children.

During on-site interviews, respondents attributed the decline in the number of cases to the increasing complexity of cases investigated. Task forces often focus on the upper-level drug trafficker rather than the street-level trafficker. When the ‘king-pins’ in the organization are identified and arrested, the task force then deals with those individuals selling drugs on the street. The goal is to “bump up” or to move up in the levels of an organization in order to ensure the removal from the community of the key figures in drug trafficking.

Finally, one respondent stated that drug enforcement has changed in recent years because of the drug shift from cocaine, which was produced overseas and distributed in the United States, to the production and distribution of methamphetamine in the United States. As a result, the U.S. became a source country for methamphetamine and law enforcement altered its operations to respond to this situation.

Table 1. Arrests, Prosecutions, and Convictions by Fiscal Year For Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces (N=59)			
	Arrests	Prosecutions	Convictions
1999-2000	13,852	7,599	6,598
2000-2001	13,136	8,880	7,060
2001-2002	15,134	8,125	7,027
Total	42,122	24,604	20,685

Table 1 indicates that over forty-two thousand drug-related arrests were reported during FYs 1999-2001. Almost twenty-five thousand prosecutions and

over twenty thousand convictions were also reported during the three year evaluation period.

Search warrants provided task forces with a valuable tool in obtaining evidence for prosecution. According to the information reported by task force project personnel, law enforcement officers prepared between 2,400 and 2,600 search warrant affidavits each fiscal year during the evaluation period. In many cases, these affidavits were reviewed by a prosecutor assigned and/or available to the task force. This practice increases the likelihood of judicial approval for the search activity.

Task force personnel coordinate efforts to conduct probation and parole searches. In some counties, the names and addresses of probationers and parolees, who are suspected of violations (e.g., testing positive for drug use), are provided to law enforcement officers for follow-up. In other counties, the probation or parole officers are more involved—carrying a weapon and assisting in the actual search of probationers and parolees, respectively, or functioning as investigators on the team.

Table 2. Number of Probation and/or Parole Searches by Fiscal Year for California Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces (N=59)	
1999-2000	6,930
2000-2001	5,354
2001-2002	4,952
Total	17,236

Table 2 indicates that task force personnel conducted a total of 17,236 probation and/or parole searches over the three year period. The number of searches conducted decreased during each

fiscal year. MJTF project staff report that this may be due to probationers or parolees who are less willing to violate the terms of their probation or parole due to the consequences for such behavior. An alternative explanation is that county probation budgets experienced cuts that may increase probation officer caseloads and reduce the amount of time available for searches. In addition, MJTF staff indicated that in some cases, these budget cuts result in the removal of the probation officer from the task force.

One respondent during the on-site interviews cited recent court decisions relating to probation and parole searches that are a source of some confusion for task force members. The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals excluded evidence obtained through use of a probation search because it was conducted for a purpose other than the rehabilitation of the probationer. Although the United States Supreme Court reversed this decision in 2001 and reinstated the broad use of probation searches, the Ninth Circuit subsequently imposed a reasonable suspicion requirement on parole searches in *U.S. v. Crawford* in March 2003. Because parolee searches are held to a higher standard than probationary searches, it is understood that the same criterion applies to probationary searches: officers must have reasonable suspicion or consent before a search is conducted.

The dilemma for these task force members is knowing whether, in a particular case, they meet the standard of reasonable suspicion in order to lawfully conduct a parole and/or probation search. Officers were also notified that if they do not have reasonable suspicion or consent when conducting a Fourth Waiver search and there is a section 1983

action brought in either state or federal court against the officer, qualified immunity will not apply and the department and the officer could be held liable. We believe that these rulings have created a quandary in the field and may offer one explanation for the three-year drop in the number of probation and parole searches.

Table 3.	Number of Probation Revocations by Fiscal Year (N=59)	Prosecutors initiated or completed over 5,000 probation revocation hearings between FY 1999 and FY 2001 (see Table 3). The number of revocations reported decreased during each fiscal year. MJTF members theorize that this decrease in probation revocations is due in part to greater compliance by targeted offenders with the terms of their probation.
1999-2000	2,338	
2000-2001	1,630	
2001-2002	1,478	
Total	5,446	

Other respondents interviewed during the on-site interviews suggested that the current state and local government budget crisis has resulted in two situations: 1) many county probation departments are experiencing budget cutbacks that necessitate removal and/or reduction in hours for the probation officer assigned to the task force; and 2) probation practice that requires a large number of violations or new criminal activity before revocation because of its impact on jail space and court time.

In the process of searching the properties of probationers and other suspected drug offenders, law enforcement officers seize the weapons used to protect drug supplies. In at least one county, all weapons seized are destroyed in an effort to avoid having them sold at auctions.

Table 4.	Number of Weapons Seized by Fiscal Year (N=59)
1999-2000	2,362
2000-2001	2,300
2001-2002	2,995
Total	7,657

Table 4 indicates that law enforcement officers seized between 2,300 and 3,000 weapons (weapon type not specifically defined) per year, for a total of 7,657 over the three year evaluation period. Although the data do not indicate a steady rise in the number of weapons

seized, FY 2001-02 data show a sizable increase as compared to FY 1999-00 or FY 2000-01 data. This is consistent with the experience of at least one task force whose project personnel report that more weapons are being discovered, especially in marijuana cases.

MJTF project personnel report that removing assets is a significant way to slow and dismantle drug trafficking organizations. Without their accumulated profits from illegal activities, the organization's purchasing power in the drug marketplace is diminished. Drug traffickers are so protective of their assets that they will often agree to forfeit the assets previously seized in an attempt to avoid publicly revealing any of their other assets.

Table 5.	Number of Asset Seizures by Fiscal Year (N=59)
1999-2000	378
2000-2001	257
2001-2002	249
Total	884

Table 6.	Value of Assets Seized by Fiscal Year (N=59)
1999-2000	\$10,493,441
2000-2001	\$7,812,887
2001-2002	\$8,151,228
Total	\$26,457,556

Table 5 indicates that law enforcement officers seized 884 items that were obtained as a result of illegal activities over the three years. These items included cash, vehicles, and other valuables. Table 6 indicates the estimated value of all assets seized during each fiscal year of the grant evaluation period. Although there is some fluctuation over the

three year period, the total estimated value of all assets seized was well over 26 million dollars.

Task force personnel report that seizing and dismantling drug labs reduces the availability of drugs and improves public safety. In an effort to accomplish these goals, investigators receive and provide training on identifying drug labs to local patrol officers and community groups. They also work on developing informants to provide intelligence about drug labs as well as obtaining cooperation of local merchants to identify individuals interested in purchasing large amounts of precursor chemicals for manufacturing methamphetamine.

Law enforcement efforts lead to the discovery of more mobile and discreet drug labs that can be seized and dismantled, often with the assistance of allied agencies. These agencies play a key role at the crime scenes as several issues must be dealt with—including the removal of children exposed to the drug labs.

Table 7.	Number of Drug Labs Seized or Dismantled by Fiscal Year (N=59)	MJTF officers have seized and dismantled nearly 1,000 or more drug labs each year during the grant evaluation period (see Table 7). A total of 3,482 drug labs were seized and/or dismantled during FYs 1999 - 2001. The number of drug labs seized and dismantled has been decreasing which is consistent with a study compiled by the Inland Narcotics Clearing House.
1999-2000	1,358	
2000-2001	1,134	
2001-2002	990	
Total	3,482	

A recent issue of the *Sacramento Bee* (March 24, 2003) described some of the findings contained in the 2002 Hammer Report including the following claim made by law enforcement experts that:

...the drop in methamphetamine lab seizures reflects new strategies used to combat production, such as state and federal limits on the purchase of equipment and chemicals used in the drug's manufacture.

During the on-site interviews, several respondents indicated that due to aggressive enforcement efforts, the manufacturers are producing more of the drugs in Mexico in part because the precursors are unregulated. One respondent stated that the chain is looking like this: buy raw materials in Canada, produce in Mexico, and sell in the United States. This chain, however, may be altered by recent changes in Canada.

A Canadian law, which went into effect in January 2003, requires licenses for people who import, export, buy or sell pseudoephedrine. This synthetic compound is used mainly in cold and allergy medications and is a key ingredient in the production of methamphetamine. This new law, combined with tighter border controls implemented because of terrorist threats and the events of September 11, 2001, make it more difficult to smuggle these precursor chemicals into the United States.

Other respondents noted that the problems generated by methamphetamine labs will continue because the production of methamphetamine is relatively easy. Many individuals produce methamphetamine in their homes and have what drug enforcement specialists refer to as 'home or user labs,' or 'tweaker labs,' which is a term used to apply to high intensity methamphetamine users. In addition, one jurisdiction noted that offenders are moving the methamphetamine labs to car repair facilities because of their location in commercial and industrial areas, and the fact that any noxious fumes or strange smells will not generate any concern by the neighbors. The offenders can also work nights and weekends and not create any suspicion.

Methamphetamine labs have also become smaller and more streamlined, which requires different investigative and enforcement strategies. This is another element that may explain the reduction in the number of drug labs dismantled over the three-year evaluation period. In addition, labs have dispersed to remote areas due to enforcement pressures. A final explanation is that the expertise, specialized training, and resources needed to effectively close a methamphetamine lab may require MJTFs to seek assistance from other task forces or law enforcement specialists to process labs.

According to MJTF project personnel, task forces receive training on locating areas of marijuana growth. The purchase of specialized surveillance equipment (including an airplane) has provided law enforcement with increased opportunities to locate areas of marijuana cultivation. Commercial advertisements such as Crime Stoppers also assisted in the identification of marijuana gardens. Task force personnel work with allied agencies on investigations of marijuana cultivation sites prior to apprehending and aggressively prosecuting marijuana cultivators. They also work with the Campaign Against Marijuana Plantations (CAMP) to eradicate marijuana plants.

Table 8.	Number of Marijuana Areas Eradicated by Fiscal Year (N=59)
1999-2000	71
2000-2001	88
2001-2002	95
Total	254

There are an increasing number of marijuana areas eradicated by the task forces each fiscal year (see Table 8). During the evaluation period, over 250 areas were eradicated. This may be an underestimate of the real number of marijuana areas eradicated, because either there

are more areas out there that are not yet discovered or other allied agencies serve as the lead in marijuana investigation and eradication and the MJTF does not take credit for this activity.

When discussing the overall drug problem, task force members report that illegal drugs are responsible for an increase in organized crime, gang activities, and narcotics-related violence. With that in mind, locating drugs and removing drug traffickers are important objectives for task forces. To meet these objectives, a number of task forces have incorporated a K-9 unit to help locate drugs. They also work with postal workers and/or other parcel company employees to help identify packages that may contain illegal substances.

Some task force members stated that enforcing drug laws by removing drug traffickers in one county may increase the price of drugs and reduce the availability of those drugs in that county as well as neighboring counties. Incarceration prohibits these traffickers from selling drugs or continuing their illegal enterprises, which may significantly reduce crime rates.

Table 9. Total Amount of Drugs Seized By Measure FY 1999 – FY 2001

Drug	Amount	Measure
Marijuana	129,347,495	Grams
Cocaine	1,167,327	Grams
Methamphetamine	210,007	Grams
Heroin	38,105	Grams
Mushrooms	1,964	Grams
Gamma Hydroxybutyrate (GHB)	909	Grams
Ecstasy	623	Grams
Hash	523	Grams
<i>Precursor Chemicals:</i>		
Ephedrine	1,173,968	Grams
Pseudoephedrine	265,953	Grams
Methamphetamine	385,223	Milliliters
Ecstasy (MDMA)	1,810	Milliliters
Gamma Hydroxybutyrate (GHB)	946	Milliliters
Lysergic Acid Diethylamide	264,202	Dosage Units
Ecstasy	25,626	Pills
<i>Precursor Chemicals:</i>		
Pseudoephedrine	717,939	Pills
Ephedrine	1,500	Pills

As can be seen in Table 9, over 129 million grams of marijuana were seized by task force officers. The amount of marijuana reported is far greater than any other drug seized. During the evaluation period, over one million grams of cocaine were also seized. Methamphetamine was reported in both solid and liquid forms. MJTF officers seized 210,007 grams and 385,223 milliliters of this drug. In addition, over 38,000 grams of heroin were seized from targeted offenders. Various club drugs (e.g., MDMA, Ketamine, GHB), as well as a large amount of precursor chemicals used to manufacture

methamphetamine were also seized.

Respondents during the on-site interviews were asked whether the task force priorities and focus were appropriate to the drug problem in their jurisdiction. They all stated that

the coordinated efforts of the task force were geared towards removing and/or diminishing the availability of the drug that posed the most significant problem in the area (e.g., marijuana, methamphetamine, or cocaine). This in turn produced the most significant impact on the community.

The data document that the 59 MJTFs examined in the report are working to meet the grant objectives to reduce the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers through arrest, prosecution, and conviction. The data indicate strong efforts and successes by the MJTFs to remove street, mid- and high-level drug traffickers.

Did the Program Elements Work?

In order to address the question whether the program elements worked, it is important to identify and describe the best practices currently used by the MJTFs.

Best Practices

An analysis of the data and information contained in the narrative section of the progress reports, and gleaned from the focus group meetings and on-site interviews suggest the presence of many best practices. Some of these best practices have been or will be addressed in other sections of this report. However, a separate overview will provide a more detailed understanding of these best practices.

Vertical prosecution, including filing and arguing motions to retain offenders in jail prior to trial, is an effective strategy to ensure a higher conviction rate for the offenders targeted by the task forces. Respondents noted that without a prosecutor dedicated to task force cases, many suspects would escape review. The assigned district attorney can charge immediately even on minor cases that other district attorneys may choose not to prosecute. This keeps the suspected drug offender in the justice system and out of the community. More importantly, prosecutors remain with a case from filing through

disposition, thus avoiding cases becoming lost in large caseloads and falling by the wayside.

Some district attorneys seek state prison commitments in all drug lab cases, especially if children are involved. Data also revealed that even without vertical prosecution, prosecutorial involvement in the review of search warrant affidavits and complaints increases the probability of receiving judicial approval. Administrative leadership, as demonstrated for example by direct communications between various department heads and subsequent assignment of personnel, is another practice that supports task force activities. Strong administrative leadership also creates a solid foundation for the people who continue to rotate in and out of the task force.

Several respondents also stated during the on-site interviews that the creation and continued support for a ‘culture of cooperation’ strengthens the ability of the drug task force to carry out its mission. The commitment of task members to the vision and mission of the MJTF ultimately leads to its success in all aspects of drug enforcement. The inclusion of all represented agencies in the county is also vital to the success of the task force.

A representative from a local police department, for example, can be beneficial when investigating and/or conducting a search in his/her local jurisdiction. The officer knows the local rules and procedures, and can ensure task force compliance with such rules. This facilitates crossing city and county boundaries to enforce the drug laws, as drug traffickers are known to move between and within different geographic boundaries.

The daily, weekly and/or monthly meetings and debriefings among the members of the task force ensure open communication, and shared knowledge of pending cases and ongoing investigations. While the frequency of these intra-task force meetings varied

depending on the structure of the task force (e.g., co-location, separate location for district attorney), all respondents during focus group meetings and on-site interviews emphasized the significant value of these meetings.

Drug buys by undercover officers and in some cases in lieu of using confidential informants, provide more control over a case and enhance the use of evidence collected for a search and/or arrest warrant. Other examples of best practices include jointly investigated cases, aggressive asset forfeiture investigations, identifying laboratories, and other proactive investigative strategies that have proven extremely effective.

The co-location of task force members, and the inclusion of agency staff such as a child protective service worker, increase communication and enhance effective coordination. It was evident during the on-site interviews that co-location of team members is by far one of the most important best practices of their task force. One task force has all team members participate in searches and stings. This practice fosters a team spirit, creates a feeling of camaraderie, and makes task force members believe that they are doing something very positive for the community.

Many metropolitan areas are fragmented into multiple jurisdictions. Often these individual cities lack the resources to mount a major offensive against overt street trafficking of drugs. On-site interviews revealed a successful model for a mobile street-level enforcement team. This model has several elements that serve as best practices for replication:

- Prospective local jurisdiction (e.g., city or unincorporated area of the county) defines its drug problem and identifies target area(s);
- Task force establishes its presence (e.g., mobile unit) in that jurisdiction;

Pre-deployment briefings are conducted between task force members and law enforcement representatives of the local jurisdiction who will also be assigned temporarily to the task force; and

Task force establishes operations for set period of time (e.g., three months) and then moves to the next jurisdiction.

The value of this model is that the selected local law enforcement representatives working with the task force are provided with new skills, the jurisdiction gets a better handle on its drug problem, and the community sees immediate results of these joint efforts.

Another best practice is joint training sessions with task force members and where appropriate, cross-training between agencies. The sharing of information specific to one agency with other agency staff involved in the task force minimizes misunderstandings and the potential for miscommunication that can compromise task force operations. Almost without exception, respondents during the on-site interviews indicated that the training offered by the California Narcotic Officers' Association (CNOA) was excellent and invaluable.

In one jurisdiction, task force members said they participate in monthly meetings with all narcotics officers in the county. Another task force indicated they participate in law enforcement advisory meetings two to four times a year. These joint meetings allow participants to share intelligence and learn how other agencies handle their respective drug problems. This knowledge can then be applied to their own drug enforcement efforts.

Another form of communication is conducting community forums on a regular basis. This external effort notifies the community that the drug task force is in operation and that the community members are part of any effort to eradicate drugs.

County-wide protocol on handling drug-endangered children encourages multi-agency coordination. The focus group meeting participants who are actively engaged in dismantling methamphetamine drug labs emphasized the importance of establishing processes and procedures for the handling of children who live where offenders maintain these labs. Other county-wide efforts include coordinating efforts with welfare fraud investigators to reduce related welfare costs and with the housing authority to investigate tenants who are suspected of dealing drugs.

Several respondents noted that a front-end investment in expensive equipment, such as a surveillance van or airplane, would pay for itself quickly because of the ability of the task force to gather intelligence in an effective and efficient manner. They also noted that the equipment could be shared with other task forces and local jurisdictions. Thus, the short and long term benefits outweigh the costs. One example of the benefits is as follows: most defendants plead out quickly when shown some photo surveillance or when listening to an audio tape of their drug deal(s).

All of these best practices are evidence of the continuing efforts that the MJTFs make in order to achieve the program goal of reducing the illegal activities of drug traffickers. Another way to examine whether the program elements worked for these MJTFs is to look at the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) 12 critical elements of successful task forces. Each element will now be briefly identified and then discussed as it pertains to the task forces. For a complete description of the critical elements, see Appendix 5.

Critical Element 1: Written interagency agreements

All MJTF counties have written interagency agreements outlining task force operations. Most counties had a formal Operational Agreement (OA) that outlined the goals and objectives, the structure of a steering committee or advisory board, the responsibilities of

each participating agency, and a plan for the distribution of asset forfeiture monies. Some operational agreements included a number of other items including policies regarding sharing information and training. One MJTF who participated in the on-site interviews provided researchers with a copy of its Task Force Policies and Procedures Manual that addresses all aspects of task force operations (e.g., training, budget, personnel, and asset forfeiture).

Critical Element 2: Prosecutor involvement

Most MJTF project personnel report that prosecutors are highly involved with task force operations. Eight of the eleven prosecutors interviewed on-site stated that they review all search warrant affidavits and complaints, while the other three review a smaller proportion of affidavits and complaints. Our data also suggest that task forces have prosecutors available by phone to consult with investigators during the preparation of these warrants.

Prosecutors often are available ‘24/7’ to review search warrant affidavits prior to submitting them for judicial approval. They may come to the scene of an arrest and then vertically prosecute the case. In addition, prosecutors can assist at the scene by guiding the gathering of evidence and providing training to task force officers. Many respondents stated that without vertical prosecution, the development of cases would be slower and more disjointed, and would lead to a reduction in the quality of a case for prosecution.

Several prosecutorial representatives indicated that because of their expertise and exclusive involvement in these cases, they are able to secure more prison sentences, including convictions of parents (mothers and fathers) who endanger children through their involvement with clandestine methamphetamine labs. One respondent also noted success in obtaining convictions of co-conspirators (e.g., buyer of chemicals or other precursors) at a higher rate because of the exclusive focus on task force cases. These prosecutors can also get higher bail rates and obtain judicial approval for the requirement that the defendant provide the court with documentation that the bail money is from a legitimate source, and not money from illegal activities.

Critical Element 3: Computerized information/intelligence databases and systems

Task force staff cited their use of the Western States Information Network (WSIN), the Los Angeles Clearinghouse (LACLR) and the Case Information Management System (CIMS) for the purposes of avoiding duplication and assuring coordination in investigations, locating intelligence, reducing risk during arrests and raids, and facilitating case management and the most efficient use of funds. The most common use was deconfliction, or the avoidance of multiple agencies engaging in enforcement operations at the same time and place. Failure to detect such duplication can result in both wasted resources and physical danger to officers who may be mistaken for suspects by other agencies. Secondly, deconfliction allows agencies to decide on the most appropriate jurisdiction to pursue prosecution and concentrate efforts in that jurisdiction.

Agencies involved in an investigation can also determine who has the best case and/or potential for prosecution and conviction. The agency with the greatest potential for successful prosecution and conviction would assume the lead for the case. In addition, one MJTF has representatives from two states, which allows the team members to determine in which state to prosecute a case in order to ensure a conviction and prison sentence.

One MJTF works with a county-wide report writing system that supports a common database system. This allows team members to pull up a report on an individual suspect from any law enforcement agency in the county. When asked during the on-site interviews about access to other task force member's databases, thirteen of the nineteen law enforcement respondents indicated that they have access to these other databases.

Critical Element 4: Target decision, case planning and selection, and enhanced investigation tactics

MJTF commanders and other project personnel indicated that a probation and/or parole officer can play a key role in target decision, case planning and selection, and enhanced investigation tactics. Probation/parole officers receive information about probationers/parolees that may lead them to suspect the violation of release terms (e.g., testing positive for drug use). In cooperation with law enforcement, these officers can facilitate the surveillance, investigation, and arrest of such a probationer, parolee or target.

Critical Element 5: Communication among task force participants

Communication among members of the task force often takes place in a variety of settings. Focus group participants report that updated information is shared on a regular basis through telephone contact. Project staff report that task force members meet weekly and/or monthly to discuss current cases while advisory boards or steering committees need to meet less frequently to resolve issues. There are also occasions where task force members participate together in training sessions (e.g., California Narcotic Officers' Association annual conference and Clandestine Laboratory Investigators Association meetings).

Ninety-five percent of the respondents stated that they participate in regularly scheduled meetings. While over one-third of the individuals stated that they met at least monthly, many stated that they also had weekly meetings with other task force members to share information and plan for the week, and others met more formally as needed but emphasized the on-going informal communications that are characteristic of these task forces.

Co-location by its very existence facilitates and enhances communication among team members. Respondents interviewed on-site emphasized the importance of on-going communication among task force members.

Critical Element 6: Coordination

Coordination of drug enforcement efforts is evident at different levels of program operations. Inter-county coordination takes place when task forces from two counties share information during investigations and provide services to assist each other with arrests. There are several inter-county MJTFs. Intra-county coordination occurs when task force members work together to identify, investigate, search, arrest, and prosecute drug offenders. Task force members also coordinate efforts with affiliated agencies such as the housing authority to identify and investigate suspected drug dealers. Another task force has a Child Protective Services staff member who coordinates the handling of drug endangered children.

Interagency coordination, as demonstrated by these MJTFs, is multidimensional. The multidimensional aspects include the climate (e.g., attitudes, priorities, and support of key decision-makers and the community), the resources (funding, staff, and facilities), policies (laws, regulations, interagency agreements), people (i.e., task force commander, other staff, and decision makers), and process (e.g., planning, methods of communication). Interviews with task force members confirmed the presence of each of these elements. For example, task force members maintain constant communication, whether that is achieved because of co-location, weekly and/or monthly meetings, pagers, or periodic debriefings. As noted above, several task forces include representatives from other human service agencies such as Health and Human Services.

We discovered that early commitment and buy-in by all partner agencies and individual task force participants establish legitimacy of the task force, which is critical for fostering interagency communication, cooperation, and coordination. Buy-in occurs by this early involvement of administrative leaders, a common understanding of the value of the task

force to the community and drug enforcement, and a commitment to maintain proper staffing levels and encourage camaraderie among individual task force members.

Critical Element 7: Establishment of a task force budget

Establishing a task force budget is a key element in any interagency agreement. The budget constitutes the policy document that shapes the structure and function of the task force. Allocation of resources to such activities as prosecution or probation participation will shape the task force's future. Several jurisdictions have used the Byrne funds as a sort of 'force multiplier' by adding other grant funds, city and county general fund monies, and contributions of staff or other resources to produce task force operations of substantially greater scope than would be possible with the limited Byrne funds. In these cases, the Byrne funds serve as necessary seed money to develop a task force for which city and county entities can furnish additional monies and resources.

Critical Element 8: Goals, objectives, and performance measures

The progress reports, which are prepared by MJTF personnel, clearly state a number of goals, objectives, and performance measures. According to OCJP, all drug task forces are mandated to adopt the goal of reducing illegal activities of targeted offenders through law enforcement, prosecution, and probation efforts. A mandatory objective for this goal is to conduct investigations into the primary suppliers of illegal drugs.

Critical Element 9: Monitoring and Evaluation

During each fiscal year, MJTF personnel are required to submit three progress reports: after three months, six months, and at year-end. These reports identify a task force's projected goals (e.g., number of expected arrests for a given year) and then indicate the

progress made toward meeting those goals (e.g., actual number of arrests obtained) by the end of the specified reporting period. In an effort to compile accurate numbers to submit to OCJP, some task forces report using a daily activity report to log arrests, searches, seizures, and other project activities.

OCJP staff follow-up with the MJTF in the event that questions or concerns arise regarding task force operations. MJTFs that have an officer from the California Department of Justice Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE) as the task force commander are subject to an inspection every eight months. The information gleaned from these inspections provides an opportunity for the task force to improve its efficiency and effectiveness through modifications in policies, procedures, and practice.

Critical Element 10: Staffing and recruitment

At each focus group meeting and during on-site interviews, participants discussed the qualifications needed to command a task force. They believed that this leader should have supervisory experience, narcotics investigation experience, and enjoy networking with members of the community including local politicians. Several task forces have a staff member from the BNE. They indicated that having a BNE law enforcement officer as the task force commander offered them an opportunity to receive state support and resources in some cases.

Many participants also discussed the process of recruitment for task force positions and emphasized the importance of the task force commander's involvement in the selection process. They want to emphasize with new members the importance of a culture of cooperation, commitment to the missions and goals of the task force, and recognition of the need for flexibility, especially in terms of work hours. As one respondent indicated

during on-site interviews, you need everyone to buy into the system/mission/goals of the task force. This is what leads to effective cooperation and communication.

Critical Element 11: Effective asset seizure and forfeiture activities

A number of final progress reports indicated that task forces are conducting aggressive asset forfeiture investigations. As a result of those investigations, several counties received asset forfeiture monies and reported information about those receipts to OCJP. For example, the total amount of asset forfeitures for all task forces in 1999 was \$2,059,306. In 2000, the total amount of asset forfeiture currency increased to \$15,254,607 and then decreased to \$1,342,598 in 2001. We cannot explain the fluctuations in the value of asset forfeitures. These monies are distributed in accordance with the OA adopted by the counties and may be used to clean-up dismantled drug labs or purchase needed equipment.

One MJTF has an asset forfeiture specialist on the team. This person can assist during the investigatory phase by conducting financial investigations to determine whether the individual's legitimate income justifies the lifestyle. The asset forfeiture specialist also maintains all asset seizure records and distribution of available asset forfeiture monies. This specialist provides the task force with the flexibility to generate additional financial resources to support task force activities.

Critical Element 12: Technical assistance and training

MJTF personnel both receive and provide training throughout each year. Task force officers may be sent to a class on advanced investigative or surveillance techniques and then provide such training to local law enforcement officers. They are also called upon to provide a variety of assistance to local law enforcement agencies who may be conducting

investigations that would benefit from the expertise of an experienced investigator with access to specialized equipment. Several MJTFs found tactical training (e.g., firearms, forced entry) that focused on skills not used frequently but essential for effective operations was beneficial. Other task force members participate in Department of Justice training.

As noted earlier and confirmed during our on-site interviews, most if not all MJTF members attend the California Narcotic Officers' Association annual conference that offers California Peace Officer Standards and Training (POST) certified training. They indicated that the opportunity to communicate with other drug task force personnel and participate in training sessions also helps them operate in a more efficient and effective manner.

Several respondents participate in the California Precursor Committee, which is part of the National Methamphetamine Chemicals Initiative (NMCI) run by the United States Attorney General's Office. Participants attend bi-monthly meetings to get updates on new laws, regulations and trends, and other information related to the methamphetamine problem.

Section Summary

Our data did not allow us to determine whether these twelve critical elements for successful MJTFs were present in every task force. We can state, however, in terms of the Byrne-funded Anti-Drug Abuse (ADA) program that the specific activities of the MJTFs in this program enhanced interagency cooperation, increased agency coordination, and allowed funding of narcotics enforcement activities that otherwise would not have been performed. The data also show high levels of drug seizures that reduce the availability of drugs in our communities.

Were the Funds Spent Efficiently?

Efficiency is defined as acting or producing effectively with a minimum of waste or unnecessary effort. The current Byrne-grant model, as applied in the State of California, utilizes local expertise in each of the counties to identify and target these limited funds to the highest priority drug enforcement problems as identified by the experts in that location. Such a model produces innate efficiencies through low overhead and effective targeting.

This funding model does not readily lend itself to quantitative comparisons and analysis because of the diverse nature of these activities. We are able to state, based on our analysis of the progress report data and information obtained through the focus group meetings and on-site interviews, that this grant program is operating with an efficient model making effective use of funds. During on-site interviews, respondents stated that they were able to achieve success with their efforts because they made effective use of their physical and human resources. Future research that has a more audit rather than evaluative focus may provide more quantitative measures of the efficiency of these MJTFs.

To further explain, task force commanders reported during focus group meetings that the Byrne funds provided them with the ability to purchase the resources needed to reduce the illegal activities of targeted offenders. These funds were spent on law enforcement officers who can complete thorough investigations of suspected drug offenders. In some cases, the funds were used to pay for the salary (or a portion thereof) of a probation officer to ensure that the officer has a small and specialized caseload to assist law enforcement in monitoring probationers who may be continuing their drug-related

activities. We learned during on-site interviews that many jurisdictions provide a local contribution to the Byrne funds in order to improve their efficiency and effectiveness.

Similarly, the funds were used for the salary of a prosecutor who engages in vertical prosecution to increase the likelihood that identified criminals are convicted and receive maximum sentences. In addition, some task forces used funds to purchase special equipment to augment their surveillance efforts.

In several smaller jurisdictions, these funds made possible a specialized drug enforcement effort where no such activity would otherwise exist. The drug activities in these smaller jurisdictions pose a significant potential threat to the entire state of California because of the ease of transportation of drugs on California highways and the growth of methamphetamine production and distribution.

Table 10. Amount of Grant Award, Monies Expended, and Grant Balances by Fiscal Year				In terms of the
	Grant Award	Monies Expended	Grant Balances	grant award
1999-2000	\$30,157,838	\$28,045,571	\$2,112,267	amounts, task
2000-2001	\$24,774,354	\$23,500,674	\$1,273,680	forces received
2001-2002	\$25,596,889	\$23,873,186	\$1,723,703	over 80 million
Total	\$80,529,081	\$75,419,431	\$5,109,650	

dollars in grant funding during the evaluation period to achieve their objectives (see Table 10). Collectively, the task forces spent over 75 million or 94 percent of their grants. The remaining grant balances were returned to OCJP to support other drug and violent crime initiatives.

The MJTFs that are under the command of the California BNE are subject to inspections every eight months on 35 inspection points. One respondent stated that these inspections ensure that the task force is spending its funds on approved activities and is operating in an efficient manner.

Was the Intended Problem Addressed?

Through the coordinated efforts of law enforcement, prosecution, and probation agencies, each task force worked toward the goal of reducing the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers. One of the most important factors in accomplishing this objective was the leadership by task force administrators. During the focus group meetings, MJTF commanders discussed the benefit of having a sheriff who was involved and participating in the task force activities.

The prosecution component played a significant role in reducing the illegal activities of targeted offenders. Prosecutorial review of search warrant affidavits prior to court submission increased the likelihood of judicial approval. Prosecutors who engaged in

vertical prosecution reduced the likelihood of plea bargains and minimal sentences upon conviction.

The probation component also plays an important role in the reduction of illegal activities. Probation officers with reduced and specialized caseloads are able to closely monitor their probationers. If probation officers suspect their probationers of drug-related or other illegal activities, they can work with task force officers to conduct probation searches as appropriate.

Sharing information and equipment enhances a task force's ability to achieve the goal of decreasing illegal activities in their county. Although some focus group participants and interviewees mentioned using regular telephone contact (i.e., Nextel) to share information with members of the task force, other participants suggested that the co-location of task force components would facilitate additional information exchanges. Task forces also shared equipment, especially with local law enforcement agencies that may not have the resources to purchase such items.

Aggressive asset forfeiture investigations are beneficial to the task force as a practical enforcement tactic. Assets seized at a crime scene and later forfeited to the task force sends a powerful message to suspected drug dealers—i.e., they will not profit from their illegal drug activities. The asset forfeiture monies received also make the task forces more viable as they can use these funds to clean up dismantled drug labs or purchase needed equipment.

Training on the use of a K-9 program has been provided to field officers and at least one task force reported borrowing a K-9 unit from the California Highway Patrol to conduct searches. Other task forces have purchased their own K-9 units and those who have used this type of assistance agree that it is invaluable while conducting searches for illegal

drugs. Focus group participants reiterated a similar belief indicating that K-9 assistance was especially useful in smaller counties where task forces may have fewer investigators for each case.

Task force members recognize the importance of establishing a working relationship with Child Protective Services or developing a Drug Endangered Children program to provide services to children that are exposed to dangerous chemicals by drug manufacturing caretakers. These children may be removed from the home and their ‘caretakers’ often face drug charges as well as charges related to child neglect. This activity sends another strong message to drug manufacturers that they cannot place children at risk while continuing to engage in illegal activities.

What Lessons Were Learned for Other Agencies?

Task force members recognize that the inclusion of personnel from law enforcement, prosecution, and probation agencies is critical to the success of a task force. A part of this includes the ‘buy-in’ of all members of the task force to the mission and goals. The socialization of individual members into the task force enhances commitment and cohesion among task force members and encourages efficient MJTF operations. In addition, many respondents indicated that selection for assignment to a task force is perceived as highly desirable and this also enhances individual member’s buy-in and cooperation. Cooperation is key. As one respondent noted, “You need people who are interested in doing the job for the right reasons and are committed to the mission of the task force.”

MJTF staff learned that it is critical to do a full assessment of the drug problem and to establish a plan that responds to the problem. Other considerations include the need to periodically reevaluate the plan, based on changing elements of the drug problem and/or

modifications in funding and staffing. There should also be agreement, understanding, and commitment to the task force policies and procedures. In some instances, the process of negotiating some of these policies and procedures could be protracted because of individual member agency restrictions and requirements.

Each participant brings certain expertise and skills to the task force. Probation personnel identify individuals suspected of illegal activities, supply intelligence to task force investigators, provide access to records, and assist in searches. Law enforcement agents conduct thorough investigations of targeted offenders, engage in searches for illegal substances, and conduct arrests for drug related activities. Prosecutors file cases against offenders, prosecute those cases, and obtain convictions that take criminals off the streets.

Regular communication among these participants creates good working relationships that can result in reducing the availability of drugs in their counties. If a task force is able to obtain a staff person to handle asset forfeitures, one respondent emphasized that the task force should not take cases based just on the potential forfeitures but rather the degree of community harm presented by the drug traffickers and/or suppliers.

While each participant comes to the task force with certain skills, respondents in the interviews stated that they benefited greatly from their involvement with the task force. Many of their skills (e.g., preparing search warrants, conducting surveillance) were strengthened and will prove beneficial to their home agency upon their return.

Effective coordination among these components is not without its challenges, however. Project personnel reported, in the progress reports, at the focus group meetings, and during on-site interviews that staff turnover was a problematic issue that needed to be addressed. The number of times we heard staff turnover mentioned as a challenge for the effective operation of a MJTF confirm it as an important consideration.

According to some MJTF commanders, a task force officer was typically assigned to participate for two to three years. During that time, the officer receives extensive training and eventually becomes an experienced investigator (at about 2 years). At this point, he

or she may be considered for promotion at their home agency, so the officer returns to that law enforcement agency—just when the investigator becomes most productive for the task force.

Staff turnover such as the investigator scenario described in the previous paragraph creates vacancies that need to be filled, which leads to the recruitment of new personnel. Some project commanders reported varying levels of involvement in the selection process—including minimal or no involvement in the hiring decisions. With minimal participation in this process, the result is often a lack of experienced investigators who need a great deal of training to become full task force members.

Other commanders indicated that the pool of qualified investigators is small and it is sometimes a challenge to obtain task force members. It may be beneficial to establish staff rotation that retains some experienced investigators to handle the most difficult cases. Most commanders emphasized the importance of maintaining quality selection procedures in an effort to hire the most qualified applicants.

Not only are there staff turnover issues within the task forces, there are personnel shortages in coordinating agencies. Such shortages may lead to inadequate responses from personnel who may be trying to participate in specific task force activities. These shortages may also result in the removal of a fully participating task force member in an effort to meet the needs of their home agency.

The California state budget crisis in 2003 is forcing participating agencies to reevaluate their resources and in some cases, has resulted in the loss of a team member (e.g., assigned probation officer). Over one-half of the respondents stated that the availability of resources (e.g., financial and staffing) was a big challenge for the task force.

Task force members also generally agree that full-time rather than part-time staffing improves the task force's ability to address drug problems in their respective counties. These shrinking resources on the state level, combined with revenue reductions at the local level, are leading to decreasing levels of support. This manifests itself in terms of the loss of task force personnel or a reduction in assigned time for participating members. Fewer resources may also hinder the ability of task force members to accrue overtime that negatively impacts the amount of time made available to investigate high-level drug offenders.

When respondents were asked what advice they would give to a county establishing a task force, almost all indicated the need to hire experienced staff (e.g., narcotics experience), provide adequate resources to carry out the mission and goals of the task force, and have a full-time assistant district attorney assigned to the task force to assist in preparing search warrant affidavits and complaints and vertically prosecuting the cases.

Another challenge results from a team member's home agency requiring him/her to attend its training. This situation reduces the amount of time that a respective team member has available to accomplish the goals and mission of the task force.

Staff turnover and other personnel shortages make it difficult to maintain the staff needed to successfully investigate, search, arrest, and prosecute drug traffickers. Targeting these offenders takes time as drug offenders are a transient population making it difficult for task force officers to develop informants. It may be necessary for those officers to use creative approaches to infiltrate tight-knit drug communities. Investigations must be thorough and can involve more than one defendant.

Another challenge is merging task force policies and procedures with the team members' individual agency's policies and procedures, and seeking agreement upfront to the task

force rules. This challenge can be mitigated by training new task force members on its policies and procedures, and when working a case in a local jurisdiction, have the task force member from that department takes the lead to ensure access and compliance with local rules.

In jurisdictions where the California Department of Justice Bureau of Narcotic Enforcement (BNE) serves as lead agency, the policies and procedures (e.g., use of informants, availability of drug buy monies, required reports) of BNE govern the operations of the multi-jurisdictional task forces. The BNE involvement is positive because of its access to additional resources (e.g., surveillance vans, helicopters, and airplanes) but may pose a challenge because of the need to use their reporting system that may not be compatible with the county reporting system, and comply with other requirements that may limit or constrict task force operations (e.g., cannot use informant unless s/he pleas to charges).

Since consent searches may be aggressively contested in court, task force members must rely on conducting probation or parole searches (e.g., Fourth Waiver searches), or obtaining search warrants. Both of these activities require coordination with other task force components (i.e., probation and prosecution) respectively. As noted earlier, a recent United States Supreme Court decision and Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals decisions on the approved basis for parole and probation searches has created some confusion in the field. To a certain degree, it has contributed to a reduction in the number of probation searches conducted as part of the drug task force activities.

Several participants cited recent litigation involving the California Highway Patrol's use of consent searches for narcotics. This litigation and subsequent departmental policy change had a chilling effect on drug interdiction efforts, particularly on the I-5 and U.S. Highway 99 corridors. These interstate highways are used to transport money,

precursors, and narcotics within the state, and to and from adjacent states, thus allowing for greater drug trafficking operations into rural areas.

Allied agencies such as Child Protective Services may also get involved at the scene of an arrest or during the prosecution of a defendant. It takes time and effort to establish cooperative working relationships, but the success of any task force can be attributed to the continuity in program operations and the assigned personnel to carry out the required tasks.

MJTF project personnel believe that full cooperation among task force members and allied agencies results in the successful apprehension and prosecution of drug offenders. Training is one way to enhance such cooperation. Approximately 90 percent of the respondents participate in joint training with other members of the task force. Almost without exception, respondents indicated that they attend the California Narcotic Officers' Association annual training, which they all indicated was superior training and provided a good opportunity to network.

Task force participants have been trained differently and can offer a variety of perspectives for resolving issues. They can learn from each other, which may improve their own job performances. They can also provide training to local law enforcement agencies and community groups who can assist them in reducing illegal activities by identifying suspicious activity and/or individuals. Education and awareness are key aspects of drug enforcement.

Other challenges that may prevent a task force from successfully addressing the drug problem in their county include busy court calendars and jail overcrowding. These challenges interfere with the prosecutor's ability to keep offenders in custody, which is important because offenders who remain in custody until their trial date are more likely to

go to trial earlier and receive longer sentences. Even if defendants are released prior to trial, prosecutors may still engage in vertical prosecution. This practice increases the number of convictions and ensures stronger sentences.

Sentencing a drug dealer to prison prevents that person from selling drugs and disrupts the market for illegal substances. Vertical prosecution is not entirely fail-safe as a method to ensure prison terms because judges may perceive drug dealers as relatively low-risk offenders and give them local sentences (jail) and/or drug rehabilitation. MJTF personnel also noted that the Proposition 36 mandate for diversion of some drug offenders has interfered with their ability to secure prison terms for some targeted offenders. Several respondents indicated that many judges do not look at the drug problem as seriously since the implementation of Proposition 36. Offenders are back on the street more quickly with these diversion alternatives. One respondent also stated that “some suspects with priors and strikes still qualify for Proposition 36 diversion.”

The practice of deconfliction, which involves contacting a network database about ongoing investigations, saves the potential problem of dual investigations, buying drugs from other undercover officers, and law enforcement agents attempting to arrest each other. Respondents overwhelmingly stated that it is also critical to officer safety and the integrity of case investigations to consult an entity that maintains information on drug and other crime-related investigations.

Several respondents suggested that it was important to focus not only on the criminal aspects of drug trafficking but the civil actions as well, such as civil abatement procedures and enforcing Section 8 housing laws. These latter actions have a very direct impact on the community.

During the focus group meetings and on-site interviews, several MJTF commanders stated that they needed more money to continue battling the drug problems in their respective counties. The amount of Byrne funds has remained static over an extended period of time. Inflation has slowly diluted the actual buying power and value of those dollars. This has necessitated a variety of adaptation strategies including reducing task force size, cutting task force member time, eliminating overtime, removing probation officer participation, among other strategies.

MJTF personnel stated that if they had more funds, they would have the resources required to purchase needed equipment (e.g., surveillance) and to implement additional task force activities (e.g., investigations). In addition, they would be able to involve or re-involve additional participants, such as child protective service workers and assistant district attorneys.

Other task force members stated that they need access to large amounts of cash in order to conduct large-scale controlled buys. As a task force shifts from street level to mid-and upper-level drug traffickers, the inability to access sufficient cash resources directly affects their ability to conduct these buys and remove the traffickers that supply street level dealers.

Although more funding may improve a task force's ability to incapacitate drug traffickers, additional funds are unlikely so task forces are faced with finding new and innovative ways (e.g., combining resources with another county) to reduce the illegal activities of serious and/or violent offenders and drug traffickers.

An issue endemic to the creation and operation of the MJTFs is the fact that a team member's home agency must always think about its own needs first and then assess its

ability to assist the MJTF. This challenge is pervasive throughout the state and will continue, regardless of budget allocations and past practices.

FURTHER FINDINGS

The qualitative data from the intensive interviews with task force members in eleven jurisdictions provide additional information that responds to the LAO evaluation questions. The information also provides insight into the successful elements and unique challenges for drug task forces. This section of the evaluation report will present those findings that are not specific to the five LAO questions but allow us to address in greater depth the unique features and best practices of successful task forces.

Task Force Features that Contribute to Effective Cooperation and Coordination

Our analysis of the progress report data and insight gained from the focus group meetings suggested the presence of many features that contribute to successful operations. These include but are not limited to co-location of members, vertical prosecution, administrative leadership, drug buys, aggressive asset forfeiture investigations, and joint training. Co-location can also apply when the Byrne-funded multi-jurisdictional task force is physically located with other drug enforcement task force or law enforcement entity (e.g., BNE, Drug Enforcement Administration). It was generally viewed as a positive structure that facilitated unofficial and informal communication, cooperation, and coordination.

During our interviews, all respondents were asked to describe three key features of their task force that contribute to effective cooperation and coordination. Many of the respondents indicated that vertical prosecution and the expertise of the task force members were major features. Researchers often heard the respondents talk about the ‘camaraderie’ that was both an essential feature and an important factor that contributed to the ease and frequency of communication and the success of the task force.

In those jurisdictions with a focus on Drug Endangered Children (DEC), the task forces are called in when methamphetamine labs are discovered and children are involved. The prosecutor can then charge on drug-related criminal violations and other charges related to child endangerment. Respondents indicated that where local law enforcement comes upon a lab, those officers would normally send the children present in the home to a relative or a neighbor. With a DEC team, the children may be removed from the home pending charges (e.g., child endangerment) against the suspects.

Others indicated that there was a mutual gain and benefit from cooperative training and investigations. This multi-agency approach is common to all 59 multi-jurisdictional task forces evaluated as part of this research. Respondents articulated the need for full agency participation and complete buy-in by the administrative leadership, task force commanders, and line personnel. The success of the task force was perceived as dependent on the presence of this support, leadership, and buy-in. Other team member qualifications included a commitment to a spirit of cooperation and camaraderie, expertise in narcotics investigative techniques, a commitment to serve the public, and a strong personal and professional ethical standard.

To gain further understanding about the impact of these task forces on local drug enforcement, task force members were asked what would happen if the drug task force ceased to exist tomorrow. With budget cuts throughout state and local government, inflation, and multiple community and law enforcement priorities, respondents indicated that drug enforcement as we know it now would be inextricably altered. In rural areas, proactive drug enforcement by local agencies would virtually cease to exist.

In suburban and urban areas, the responsibility for drug enforcement would fall back on local law enforcement (i.e., street teams) and would not have the priority that it currently has with the MJTF. The enforcement of mid-and upper-level drug trafficking would not

receive the attention it currently receives from most task forces, because many local law enforcement agencies are more focused on street-level drug trafficking and do not have the resources to conduct more lengthy investigations required when focusing on mid-and upper-level drug suppliers.

In addition, children present in the homes where methamphetamine is produced would not receive the same level of attention. There would be no DEC program that provides additional protections to the children (e.g., treat them like victims and provide appropriate services), and suspects may be able to secure reduced charges because of the loss of a dedicated prosecutor.

Respondents also noted that if the task force ceased to exist, overall interagency cooperation and coordination would suffer. It would increase the fragmentation of drug enforcement in a jurisdiction and limit their ability to be responsive to the drug problems.

A related concern was that the officers who assume the responsibility for drug enforcement would not have the training and level of expertise of the MJTF members. A county would lose the investigative expertise of the task force members that contribute to more successful handling of drug trafficking cases. This situation may also have consequences for the number of prosecutions and convictions of street, mid-and upper-level drug traffickers.

Several respondents stated that large-scale investigations would be limited and the expertise (e.g., dismantling methamphetamine labs and related safety concerns) and assistance currently provided by the MJTF to local law enforcement agencies would stop. Their concern was that the volume of drugs would increase and the age of users would decrease. As one respondent noted, the elimination of a specialized enforcement team may result in an increase in drug-related crimes.

Unintended Consequences

Respondents were asked to describe any unintended consequences that resulted from their presence in the county. The majority of task force members indicated that their expertise in proactive drug enforcement investigations and access to and availability of specialized surveillance equipment became an invaluable resource for other law enforcement agencies in their jurisdiction.

Several respondents also stated that they received additional training as a member of the task force that was not available through their home agency. An unexpected benefit was that the new knowledge, skills, and abilities gained through the training and experience on the task force would be taken back with them to their home agency. Also, task force members now have a network of law enforcement contacts throughout the county that they can call in the future.

They also periodically assisted in local law enforcement stings, recovery of firearms from felons, arrest of child molesters and child pornographers, and worked side-by-side in other crime-related enforcement. This assistance role is important because the task force depends on the political and financial support from all agencies in the county who are contributing staff and/or resources to the task force. Approximately one-third of the respondents stated that this opportunity to assist other agencies was a welcome though unplanned benefit.

Another unintended consequence was the effect their investigations had on other potential cases. Termed the ‘domino effect,’ respondents indicated that while investigating one case, they would gain intelligence on other drug traffickers that would then lead to another investigation. Also mentioned by several respondents were the effects of co-location.

The constant communication built rapport among the team members and minimized the need for more formal weekly and/or monthly meetings.

An unintended consequence is the opportunity for the sheriff, district attorney, chief probation officer, and local police chiefs to meet regularly as part of the Steering Committee. These committee meetings provide a venue to debrief these county and city law enforcement leaders on drug enforcement efforts.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The recommendations below address how the Byrne-funded multi-jurisdictional drug task forces can improve their program. The data for these recommendations come from the analysis of the task force progress reports, five focus group meetings conducted across the state, and eleven in-depth on-site interviews of MJTF personnel. The recommendations are not presented in any particular order of importance. Chart 2 entitled *Major MJTF Recommendations Based on Focus Group Meetings, Progress Report Data and On-Site Interviews* contains a concise summary of these recommendations (see Appendix 6).

Recommendation 1: MJTF Policy and Procedures Manual

Each task force has an Operational Agreement (OA) and/or Memorandum of Understanding (MOU). Some task forces policies and procedures are governed by the BNE manual. These documents generally describe the goals of the task force, list participating agencies and their respective responsibilities, include policies and procedures pertaining to the organization and operation of the task force, and a plan for distribution of forfeited assets. During one on-site interview, we were provided with a copy of that task force's policies and procedures manual. It contained information that was far more comprehensive than the contents of the OAs or MOUs. We should note that other MJTFs may also have written manuals. However, our research design limited our focused review to eleven task forces.

The manual includes information relating to employee conduct, administrative procedures, office procedures, injury on duty, field enforcement operations, firearms, evidence, confidential source procedures, investigative funds, equipment, vehicles, report writing, and asset forfeiture. Such a comprehensive manual ensures clarity of mission and goals,

operating procedures, and protocol for task force investigations. It also meets one of the 12 critical elements of successful task forces suggested by the Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA).

Recommendation 2: Co-Location of Task Force Members

The benefits of co-location of all task force members are numerous. The ability to communicate on a daily basis, share intelligence and other information related to ongoing investigations, and seek input and guidance during the investigation are but a few of the important benefits of co-location. Communication among task force members is also one of the BJA critical elements for successful MJTFs.

If the task force includes a representative from the district attorney's office, co-location makes it easier for the prosecutor to provide assistance in all phases of an investigation from preparation of search warrant affidavits, documentation for arrest warrants, and vertical prosecution of cases. The prosecutor can also provide ad hoc training sessions at the site. In many jurisdictions, the assistant district attorney is available but not co-located with the MJTF team because of the need to be in and/or near the courthouse. Interviewees indicated that while co-location is highly desirable, the ability to call or email and receive immediate assistance is also very beneficial.

In jurisdictions where the Byrne-funded MJTF is housed with other county drug enforcement task forces, respondents indicated that this proximity strengthened their ability to provide comprehensive drug enforcement in the county and avoid concurrent multiple agencies investigating the same suspect(s).

Recommendation 3: Team Involvement in Task Force Member Selection

Task force members stated in both the focus groups and the on-site interviews that task force supervisor involvement in the establishment of standards and qualifications for participation in the task force was vital. Their participation would ensure that new recruits had the requisite knowledge, skills, and abilities (e.g., narcotics enforcement experience, specialized training) to become a full partner on the team. They also stated that because of the camaraderie among task force members, selection was important in order to ensure commonality of mission and commitment to the vision and goals of their task force. Participation in the task force requires flexibility in terms of work hours, ability to work as a team member, and an understanding that the collective efforts of the task force are designed to improve the community and are not for personal gain.

Recommendation 4: Probation and Parole Officer on MJTF

A representative from the county probation department and state parole agency ensures full participation of all the agencies involved in local drug enforcement. These individuals can participate in surveillances. A probation/parole officer, who has either a small, specialized caseload of individuals targeted by the task force, or no caseload whatsoever, has the access and time to assist other team members in the investigations. Their authority to conduct compliance searches of probationers/parolees can facilitate the timely investigation of drug cases.

Recommendation 5: Asset Forfeiture Staff Member on MJTF

The assignment to the task force of an individual to assume responsibility for asset forfeitures has numerous benefits: allows for proactive role during case investigations (e.g., financial investigations), provides potential for more funds to support task force operations, and in essence creates an additional investigator position.

Recommendation 6: Administrative Assistant for Each Task Force

An administrative assistant provides support to the task force by completing all paperwork (e.g., grant, reporting requirements) and allows other members of the task force to conduct their investigations and remain in the field. This staff person can also answer the public telephone number and make appropriate referrals to other agencies when necessary. The lack of a person to answer telephones can result in the loss of valuable information from the public and potential informants who will not speak to a recording device.

Recommendation 7: Staggered Staff Rotation

A major concern of all the task force personnel was the ability to retain experienced investigators on the team at all times. These experienced team members have the institutional memory regarding the task force's policies, procedures, and tactics, and can serve as trainer/mentor to new task force members. Thus, staffing policies must provide that rotation of staff on and off the task force retain some experienced investigators. This may require review and evaluation of current policies and practices that establish time limits for agency participation on the task force. Also, establishing a staggered rotation minimizes efficiencies lost when staff turnover and eliminates the potential for complacency that can be created by performing repetitive tasks.

Recommendation 8: Field Training Program

The creation of a field training program and the assignment of a field training officer to a new task force member ensure the smooth transition for this member, among other benefits. The field training program manual should include at a minimum the following: orientation, overview of drug identification, evidence handling, local report system, writing of search warrants, field and tactical operations, asset forfeiture, and preparation

for court. This manual should contain all the information any task force member needs to be familiar with in order to become an effective member of the task force.

The field training officer can then provide the necessary training and/or mentoring to ensure that the new officer has achieved levels of proficiency and competency needed to provide for the safety of the individual and other task force members, and the accomplishment of the goals of the task force.

Recommendation 9: Regularly Scheduled MJTF Meetings

For those task forces that are not co-located, establishing a practice of conducting weekly and/or monthly meetings and debriefings (as appropriate) is important. The frequency and content of those communications will facilitate successful operations of the task force. The meetings allow for sharing of information among task force members, provide updates on ongoing investigations, solicit input on future steps, and may assist in the preparation of cases for prosecution. An additional benefit is that the meetings allow supervisors to allocate resources efficiently and avoid duplication.

Recommendation 10: Ongoing Training of MJTF Members

The implicit value of ongoing training of all task force members can be measured by the number of successful prosecutions and convictions that are secured as a result of the investigative efforts of the task force. These efforts are strengthened when task force members are provided tactical training (e.g., forced entry, firearms), opportunities to learn how to document and write search warrant affidavits, and any other training essential to the operations of the task force (e.g., statutory and legal updates, local protocol that interface with MJTF investigations). Another option is to create a ‘mobile’ training team that trains one individual from a department (train-the-trainer) who then trains other members of that department.

Recommendation 11: MJTF Computer Terminal

Another one of BJA’s critical elements for successful drug task forces is a computerized information/intelligence database. Whether task force members are co-located or have separate offices, a computer terminal that has links to allied agencies and databases would facilitate timely investigations and minimize and/or eliminate the need for task force

members to go to an agency to obtain data. It would improve task force investigative efficiencies and effectiveness.

Recommendation 12: Vertical Prosecution

Each member of the task force performs a vital function. A representative from the district attorney's office can guide task force investigations from the beginning of the case (i.e., preparation of search warrant affidavits and complaints) to the subsequent prosecution of the case. Vertical prosecution increases the probability that a conviction will result because of the attorney's experience and specialization with these types of cases. The involvement of a prosecutor in task force operations is also one of the 12 critical elements for successful task force operations.

Recommendation 13: Standardized Progress Report Form

The creation of a standardized progress report form, with instructions, for the Byrne-funded projects would ensure common terminology and data elements. This data could be used for evaluations and audits of individual task forces and cross-comparisons between task forces. Those interested in evaluating the drug task forces would have confidence that there was a common understanding of each data element and what information was required to be submitted to document that data element (e.g., number of investigations initiated).

The reporting form should include an area to describe some of the unique features and activities of the task force, and report more qualitative progress toward achieving the task force goals. This qualitative data would complement the quantitative data and provide a more comprehensive picture of task force activities (e.g., positive media contacts, presentations to schools) and accomplishments.

Recommendation 14: Annual Review of Budget Allocation

As the value of the program dollars decrease each year, the task force needs to build an inflation factor into the budget so that the same level of service can be maintained each year. Other considerations include identifying additional financial support from the federal, state, and/or local level.

Recommendation 15: Maintain Continuing Agency Commitment to MJTF

In order to ensure continuity of services, task forces need to ensure that all partner agencies maintain a high level of commitment to the task force operations. This commitment will enhance the ability of the task force to meet its mission and goals in the most efficient and effective manner.

CLOSING REMARKS

The evaluation of the 59 MJTFs in California supported with federal Byrne funds indicates that these projects are accomplishing the goals of the Anti-Drug Abuse Program. The task forces have integrated federal, state, and/or local law enforcement, prosecution, and probation to address the local drug problem. They have also increased the depth and breadth of interagency cooperation and coordination, and facilitated multi-jurisdictional investigations. Thus, jurisdictional concerns among local agencies are virtually eliminated. As many respondents suggested throughout the on-site interviews, funding these task forces seems to be compatible with existing drug enforcement efforts and does not foster any interagency conflicts.

The MJTFs provide a significant and valuable service to their communities. With their expertise, the drug task force members are able to provide comprehensive drug enforcement within their jurisdiction through their individual efforts and by providing assistance to federal, state, and local agencies. When the task force assists agencies such as parole agencies, U.S. Customs, and Federal Bureau of Investigation, they are able to bring their knowledge, skills and abilities in drug enforcement to investigations of street, mid- and upper-level drug traffickers. Task forces that focus on drug endangered children provide protection to these children that otherwise may not be available. In many instances, they are the only operating drug enforcement team in a jurisdiction. Without their efforts, drug enforcement would cease to exist in some jurisdictions.

A key feature of the MJTFs is the involvement of all agencies in the county responsible for drug enforcement. The multi-jurisdictional nature of the task force allows for extensive networking and communication. Team members bring specialized knowledge from their respective agency as well as specialized resources such as access to offender

databases. There are multiple models for these MJTFs and each jurisdiction has created an organizational structure that most effectively addresses the drug problem in their respective area. The bottom line for many of these task force members is that the county must always have the flexibility to establish their priorities and focus on their particular drug problems. There cannot be a ‘cookie-cutter’ approach to drug enforcement.

The evaluation data suggest that the keys to success of a MJTF are a shared vision, high level of integrity, and a commitment to ethical conduct in the investigation and prosecution of cases. Many respondents throughout our focus group meetings and on-site interviews emphasized the important service they provide to the citizens in their jurisdictions. While closing one crack house on a block may seem unimpressive, it is an extraordinarily significant event for those individuals living next to or near that house. The efforts of a task force to remove the offenders and initiate code enforcement and/or civil abatement procedures on that house are valued by the task force members and the community.

Without the Byrne funds, many counties, particularly small rural counties, would have limited fiscal resources to create processes and procedures to incapacitate drug traffickers. The larger, more urban counties, in some cases, have been able to expand and create more complex and innovative approaches to addressing their respective drug problems. Their collective ability to meet their grant objectives, ensure that the program elements worked and funds were spent efficiently, and that the intended drug problem was addressed was documented through the analysis of the progress report data and the data generated from the focus group meetings and the on-site interviews.

APPENDIX 1: Edward Byrne Formula Grant Authorized Program Purpose Areas

1. Demand reduction education programs in which law enforcement officers participate.
 - ☐ Demand Reduction Education (not DARE)
 - ☐ Drug Abuse Resistance Education (DARE) Officer
 - ☐ Officer Training for DARE Program
2. Multi-jurisdictional task force programs that integrate Federal, State, and/or local law enforcement agencies and prosecutors for the purpose of enhancing interagency coordination and intelligence and facilitating multi-jurisdictional investigations.
 - ☐ Multi-jurisdictional Task Forces
 - ☐ Regional Drug Task Forces
 - ☐ Organized Crime/Narcotics Program
 - ☐ Special Narcotics Prosecutor (in direct support of MJTF)
 - ☐ Criminal Intelligence Systems (if drug offender specific)
 - ☐ Statewide Confidential Funds Pool/Equipment Pool
 - ☐ Regional Violent Drug Trafficker Program
3. Programs designed to target the domestic sources of controlled and illegal substances, such as precursor chemicals, diverted pharmaceuticals, clandestine laboratories and cannabis cultivations.
 - ☐ Pharmaceutical Diversion
 - ☐ Clandestine Laboratories
 - ☐ Marijuana Eradication
 - ☐ Drug Identification (laboratory-based research studies)
4. Providing community and neighborhood programs that assist citizens in preventing and controlling crime, including special programs that address the problems of crimes committed against the elderly and special programs for rural jurisdictions.
 - ☐ Community Crime Prevention
 - ☐ Crime Prevention through Environmental Design
 - ☐ Neighborhood Watch
 - ☐ Night Out (Against Crime)
 - ☐ Community Policing (but see purpose area #16)
 - ☐ Innovations in Rural Crime Control
 - ☐ Drug-Impacted Rural Jurisdictions
 - ☐ Reaching High-Risk Youth through Outdoor Activities
 - ☐ Senior Citizen Crime Prevention/Golden Alert Program
 - ☐ Prevention Burglary through Enhanced Household Security

5. Programs to disrupt illicit commerce in stolen goods and property.
 - ☐ STING
 - ☐ County Attorney's Office Property Crime Program
 - ☐ Motor Vehicle Theft Prevention

6. Programs to improve the investigation and prosecution of white-collar crime, organized crime, public corruption crimes and fraud against the government, with priority attention to cases involving official corruption.
 - ☐ Reducing Drug Corruption in Police Departments
 - ☐ Targeting White Collar Crime

- 7a. Programs to improve the operational effectiveness of law enforcement through the use of crime analysis techniques, street sales enforcement, schoolyard violator programs, gang-related and low-income housing drug control programs.
 - ☐ Street Sales Enforcement (but use purpose area #21)
 - ☐ Drug Task Force (single jurisdiction effort aimed at mid-level or higher-level traffickers)
 - ☐ Drug Enforcement in Public Housing (but use purpose area #17)
 - ☐ Juvenile Gangs Involvement in drug Trafficking
 - ☐ Gang Task Forces (exempt in 1994 from 4-year rule)
 - ☐ Drug-free Schools Zone Enforcement
 - ☐ Integrated Criminal Apprehension program (ICAP)
 - ☐ Statewide Violent Offender Apprehension
 - ☐ Arson Prevention and Control
 - ☐ Preserving the Crime Scene
 - ☐ Drug Recognition Training
 - ☐ Drug Dog/Canine Acquisition and Training/K-9 Unit
 - ☐ "Night Eyes" State Water Patrol

- 7b. Programs to develop and implement anti-terrorism plans for deep draft ports, international airports and other important facilities.

8. Career criminal prosecution programs, including the development of model drug control legislation.
 - ☐ Career Criminal/Major Offender Prosecution
 - ☐ Career Drug Offender Prosecution
 - ☐ Narcotics Prosecution Unit (but use purpose area #2 if directly in support of Multi-jurisdictional Task Forces)
 - ☐ Model Drug Control Legislation (directed at offenders)
 - ☐ Use of Civil RICO in Drug Enforcement

9. Financial investigative programs that target the identification of money laundering operations and assets obtained through illegal drug trafficking, including the development of proposed model legislation, financial investigative training and financial information sharing systems.

- ❑ Financial Investigations
 - ❑ Assets Forfeiture Units
 - ❑ Model Drug Control Legislation (directed at assets)
10. Programs to improve the operational effectiveness of the court process by expanding prosecutorial, defender and judicial resources and implementing court delay reduction programs.
- ❑ Court Delay Reduction
 - ❑ Differentiated Case Management
 - ❑ Fast Track Prosecution/Fast Track Defense
 - ❑ Drug Courts
 - ❑ Court Improvement/Court Management Improvement
 - ❑ Court Unification
 - ❑ Pretrial Services Delivery (but use purpose area #15 if primary focus is drug testing or purpose area #20 if focus is reducing jail crowding)
11. Programs to improve the corrections system and provide additional public correctional resources, including treatment in prisons and jails, intensive supervision programs, and long-range corrections and sentencing strategies.
- ❑ Intensive Supervision Probation and Parole
 - ❑ Boot Camps
 - ❑ Changing Attitudes through Physical Adventure (involving offenders only)
 - ❑ Treatment in Jail Setting
 - ❑ Treatment in Correctional Facilities
 - ❑ Correctional Facilities Planning/Population Projections
 - ❑ Sentencing Strategies Development
12. Prison industry projects designed to place inmates in a realistic working and training environment that will enable them to acquire marketable skills and to make financial payments for restitution to their victims, for support of their own families and for support of themselves in the institution.
- ❑ Prison Industries
 - ❑ Jail Industries

13. Programs that identify and meet the treatment needs of adult and juvenile drug-dependent and alcohol-dependent offenders.
 - ☐ Treatment for Drug Addicted Offenders
 - ☐ Treatment for Juvenile Offenders
 - ☐ Treatment Aftercare Unit
14. Developing and implementing programs that provide assistance to jurors and witnesses and assistance (other than compensation) of victims of crime.
 - ☐ One Day-One Trial/Jury Management Improvement
 - ☐ Systems for Setting Juror Fees/Compensation
 - ☐ Victim/Witness programs
 - ☐ Victim Assistance
- 15a. Programs to improve drug control technology, such as pretrial drug testing programs; to provide for the identification, assessment, referral to treatment, case management, and monitoring of drug-dependent offenders; and to enhance state and local forensic laboratories.
- 15b. Criminal justice information systems (including automated fingerprint identification systems) to assist law enforcement, prosecution, courts and corrections organizations.
 - ☐ Pretrial/Probation/Parole Drug Testing
 - ☐ Statewide Urinalysis Testing
 - ☐ Treatment Alternatives to Street Crimes (TASC)
 - ☐ Forensic Laboratory Enhancement
 - ☐ DNA Profiling
 - ☐ Criminal Justice Records Improvement
 - ☐ Information/Management System for Criminal Justice Agencies
 - ☐ Automated Fingerprint Identification System (AFIS)
 - ☐ Prosecution Management Support Systems
 - ☐ Video Arraignment/Pre-sentence Telecommunications Project
 - ☐ Metropolitan Intelligence Exchange (if not restricted solely to drug-related information; contrast with purpose area #2)
16. Innovative programs which demonstrate new and different approaches to enforcement, prosecution and adjudication of drug offenses and other serious crimes.
 - ☐ Weed and Seed
 - ☐ Firearms Trafficking/Firearms Control
 - ☐ Governor's Drug Summit
 - ☐ Motor Vehicle Officers' Watch for Drugs
 - ☐ Violent Fugitives Arrest Squad

17. Programs to address the problems of drug trafficking and the illegal manufacture of controlled substances in public housing.
 - ☐ Enforcement in Public Housing Developments
 - ☐ Eliminating Crack Houses (in public housing)
18. Programs to improve the criminal and juvenile justice system's response to domestic and family violence, including spouse abuse, child abuse and elder abuse.
 - ☐ Domestic/Family Violence Intervention
 - ☐ Law Enforcement's Response to Domestic Violence
 - ☐ Child Abuse Prosecution
 - ☐ Responding to Sexual Abuse of Children
 - ☐ Crimes Against the Elderly (in domestic settings)
19. Drug control evaluation programs which state and local units of government may utilize to evaluate programs and projects directed at state drug control activities.
 - ☐ Evaluation of Drug Control Programs
 - ☐ Research and Evaluation
20. Projects to provide alternatives to prevent detention, jail and prison for persons who pose no danger to the community.
 - ☐ Alternatives to Incarceration
 - ☐ House Arrest/Electronic Monitoring
 - ☐ Alternative Punishment
 - ☐ Restitution by Juveniles
 - ☐ Community Service Labor Program
 - ☐ User Accountability Sanctioning (but not if involving incarceration)
21. Programs to strengthen urban enforcement and prosecution efforts targeted at street drug sales.
 - ☐ Street Sales Enforcement
 - ☐ Street-level Narcotics Enforcement
 - ☐ Target Cities
 - ☐ Drug Enforcement Enhancement
 - ☐ Crack Houses/Nuisance Abatement Unit (exempt in 1994 from 4-year rule)
 - ☐ Reverse Sting Demand Reduction Enforcement
 - ☐ User Accountability Enforcement
22. Programs to prosecute driving while intoxicated charges and the enforcement of other laws relating to alcohol use and the operation of motor vehicles.
 - ☐ Enhanced Prosecution of DWI Cases
 - ☐ Diversion of DWI Offenders into Treatment
23. Programs that address the need for effective remand systems for the prosecution of violent 16- and 17-year-old juveniles in courts with jurisdiction over adults. Certain violent crimes including murder and felonies committed with firearms are specified, with reference to Title 18 U.S.C. 36.

24. Law enforcement and prevention programs for gangs and youth who are involved or at risk of involvement in gangs.
25. Programs to develop or improve forensic laboratory capability to analyze DNA for identification purposes. Funding in this area requires adherence to regulations developed and disseminated by the Attorney General with the assistance of the FBI and the National Institute of Justice.
26. Programs to develop and implement antiterrorism training and procure equipment for local law enforcement authorities.
27. Programs to improve the quality, timeliness, and credibility of forensic science services for criminal justice purposes.
28. Programs to enforce child abuse and neglect laws, including laws protecting against child sexual abuse, and promoting programs designed to prevent child abuse and neglect.
29. Programs to establish or support cooperative programs between law enforcement and media organizations to collect, record, retain, and disseminate information useful in the identification of suspected criminal offenders.

APPENDIX 2: Chart 1: Program Characteristics Of Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Forces

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Alameda	Alameda County Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, CA DOJ, BNE, CHP, FBI, County Chiefs and Sheriffs' Assn.	Drug interdiction, major drug distribution networks, high-level drug trafficking	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution, upper-level drug trafficking probation violators
Alpine	Alpine Narcotics Enforcement Team (ANT)	Sheriff, DA, Probation	Special Enforcement Operations	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution (when possible)
Amador	Amador Narcotics Enforcement Unit	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts. (3), County Drug Admin.	Sales of narcotics to children and young adults, high risk probationers, sales that endanger community	Sheriff	Part-time DA to advise
Butte	Butte Anti-Drug Special Supervision	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts. (2)	Drug-involved gang offenders	Probation Officer	Gang and drug suppression
Calaveras	Calaveras Narcotics Enforcement Team (CNEU)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., Alcohol and Drug Abuse Admin.	Street and mid-level drug users, traffickers and manufacturers (meth)	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution including review of arrest warrants; Probation officer works in CNEU office
Colusa	Colusa County Narcotics Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, CHP, Police Depts. (2)	Special drug investigation team (narcotics and illicit drug money travel on I-5), clandestine labs and marijuana cultivation	Task Force Commander	Closing marijuana gardens
Contra Costa	Regional Anti-Drug Abuse Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Presiding Judge, County Police Chief's Assn, County Drug Admin., and Task Force Commanders	High level drug dealers, manufacturers and drug trafficking gangs, meth manufacturers and clandestine meth labs	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Del Norte	Del Norte Inter-Agency Narcotics Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., CHP, Mental Health, Drug and Alcohol Program, Court Administrator	Marijuana cultivation and controlled substance use	Sheriff	Marijuana suppression
El Dorado	El Dorado Anti-Drug Abuse Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Police Depts.(2), County Health, South Lake Tahoe/El Dorado NET	Investigate and apprehend narcotics users and traffickers	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Fresno	Fresno County Narcotic Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., County Health Services, County Dept. of Education	Narcotics investigations (meth labs and marijuana cultivation)	Sheriff	Co-location of NET with Police Dept. Narcotic unit, collaboration with DARE, Gang Resistance Education and Training and other groups
Glenn	Tehama and Glenn Methamphetamine Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, CHP from both counties, Police Depts.(4), BNE	Street, mid-level, and major meth trafficking dealers or organizations	Task Force Commander - BNE	Two county program, prevention and education
Humboldt	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement	Sheriff, DA, Probation, CHP, Police Depts.(6)	Intensive drug prosecution of major drug manufacturers and dealers	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution, Intensive Probation Supervision
Imperial	Special Prosecutions Unit	DA, Probation, Imperial County Narcotics Task Force	Severe drug problem	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Inyo	Inyo Narcotic Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., CHP	Apprehension of illicit drug traffickers (street-level) and long-term investigations	Task Force Commander	Program designed to handle large geographic area and more sophisticated levels of drug trafficking

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Kern	Kern Narcotic Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(9), Behavioral Health administrator	Narcotics	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution, Probation officer located in Bakersfield Police Dept.
Kings	Kings County Narcotics Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, CHP, Police Depts.(3), BNE	Reduce and eliminate the use and sale of drugs	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Lake	Lake County Anti-Drug Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), County Drug Administrator	Major and mid-level drug offenders	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Lassen	Lassen County Drug Enforcement Unit	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., CHP, County Drug and Alcohol	Reduce availability of illegal drugs	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
Los Angeles	Community Oriented Multi-Agency Narcotics Enforcement Team (COMNET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation	Chronic narcotics related problems in support of the LA Sheriff's Dept. High Intensity Community Oriented policing	Sheriff	Civil abatement and crime prevention
Los Angeles	Narcotics Enforcement Surveillance Team (NEST)	Los Angeles City Police, Attorney's Office, County DA	Remove conspicuous street-level narcotics sales through surveillance, intelligence gathering, buy-busts, sell busts, and warrants	Police Department	Vertical prosecution and narcotics eviction proceedings against drug offenders residing in rental properties

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Los Angeles	LA IMPACT - Allied Laboratory Enforcement Response Team (ALERT) and Burbank Airport Narcotics Enforcement Team (BANET)	Los Angeles Interagency Metropolitan Police Apprehension Task Force - LA IMPACT (47 municipalities, Executive Council with local, state and federal law enforcement and the City of Hawthorne)	Narcotics interdiction for major airport facility and to address clandestine meth labs	County Police Chief's Association	Operational liaison with other airports in the country, air support unit, and financial investigations unit
Madera	Madera County Narcotic Enforcement Team (MADNET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), CHP, BNE, Director of Mental Health	Narcotics	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
Mariposa	Mariposa Intra-County Drug Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Chief Health Officer	Drug use, sales and manufacturing	Probation	Vertical prosecution
Marin	Coordination of Probation Enforcement	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(8), Marin Community College Police,	Reduce the availability of drugs (esp. meth) and attempt to curb gang-related violence	Sheriff	Focus on drugs in low income areas and on school grounds
Mendocino	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(3), CHP, and County Major Crimes Task Force	Major and mid-level drug offenders	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Merced	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, County Drug Admin., Police Depts.(6), BNE, CHP	Narcotics possession, production, manufacturing, sales, and trafficking	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Modoc	Interagency Drug Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., County Mental Health Services, CHP	Drug interdiction	District Attorney	Probation Drug Specialist

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Mono	Narcotics Enforcement Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., CHP, County Drug Admin., United States Forest Service	Drug trafficking	Sheriff	Forest service aircraft for location and eradication of marijuana grow sites within Forest Service boundaries; Provides assistance to Inyo as requested
Monterey	Narcotics Enforcement Unit	Sheriff, DA, Probation	Investigating and prosecuting narcotics traffickers and manufacturers	Sheriff	Focus on reducing the economic incentive to traffic in illegal drugs
Napa	Napa Special Investigations Bureau	BNE, DA, Sheriff, Police Depts. (3), Probation	Investigation and apprehension of mid-level major narcotic related violators	Task Force Commander - BNE	Increase flow of narcotic-related intelligence information between agencies
Nevada	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), County Behavioral Health Department	Street level, mid-level and major narcotic offenders	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution and non-grant funded overtime used for evening, weekend, and more random surveillances and searches
Orange	Orange County Methamphetamine Laboratory Investigation Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(21)	Eradicate clandestine meth labs	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
Placer	Placer Law Enforcement Agencies' Special Investigation Unit	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(4), BNE, CHP	Apprehension of all levels of drug traffickers with goal of identifying and apprehending major drug traffickers	Task Force Commander - BNE	Increase flow of narcotic-related intelligence information between agencies
Plumas	Plumas County Anti-Drug Enforcement Operation	Sheriff, DA, Probation	Initiate investigations involving all levels of drug sales	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Riverside	Allied Riverside Cities Narcotic Enforcement Team (ARCNET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(4), CHP, Department of Corrections (Parole), BNE	Street level and mid-level narcotics	Task Force Commander - BNE	Regional task force
Sacramento	Crack Rock Impact Project	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept.	Gang-related cocaine and meth distributors	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
San Benito	Unified Narcotic Enforcement Team (UNET)	San Benito and Santa Clara County Sheriff, DA, Police Depts.(3), CHP, BNE	Diminish the availability and use of illegal drugs, and assist in violence suppression investigations	Task Force Commander - BNE	Multi-county task force
San Bernardino	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Police Depts.(11), Office of Alcohol and Drug Program	Street level narcotics offenders and clandestine meth labs	Sheriff	Forensic Laboratory personnel assist in the dismantling of clandestine labs and chemical analyses of narcotics evidence
San Diego	Jurisdictions Unified for Drug/Gang Enforcement (J.U.D.G.E.)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(9), Parole Admin., Alcohol and Drug Services Admin.	Violent narcotics offenders and drug-involved gang members, especially those with strike convictions	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution, with focus on individuals who qualify for prosecution under the "three strikes" law
San Francisco	Drug Elimination Team (DET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Public Defender, Public Health, Police Dept., Mayor's Criminal Justice Council	Street-level dealers	Mayor's Criminal Justice Council	Vertical prosecution and Intensive Probation Supervision
San Joaquin	Combined Rural and City Narcotic Enforcement Team (CRACNET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(6), BNE, CHP	Mid to major level offenders	Task Force Commander - BNE	State, county and city coordination

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
San Luis Obispo	Gang Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Director of Drug and Alcohol Services, Police Depts.(7)	Street level, gang-related offenders	Sheriff	Continued development of criminal street gang intelligence through a statewide database, as administered by the Department of Justice
Santa Barbara	Santa Barbara Regional Narcotic Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(4), BNE, CHP	High-level drug trafficking enterprises or money laundering with high priority on those involved in importation and distribution of drugs	Task Force Commander - BNE	K-9 services
Santa Clara	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(6), Santa Clara Police Chiefs Assoc., Alcohol and Drug Dept., Superior Court, CDC Parole, BNE, CHP	Reduction of methamphetamine and the suppression of drug-related violent crime	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Santa Cruz	Anti-Drug Abuse Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, County Narcotics Enforcement Team, Police Depts.(4)	Illicit drug activities and incentives to traffic in illicit drugs	District Attorney	Co-location of team members (law enforcement and probation) and Intensive Probation Supervision
Shasta	Shasta Interagency Narcotics Task Force (SINTF)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), County Drug and Alcohol Admin., CHP, Parole, BNE	Narcotics	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
Sierra	Sierra-Nevada Joint Drug Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), Courts	Enforcement of all drug laws	Sheriff	Bi-county narcotics task force with bi-county operations and information sharing

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Siskiyou	Siskiyou County-Wide Interagency Narcotic Task Force (SCINTF)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(3), BNE, CHP	Major drug offenders and street level drug offenders	Task Force Commander - BNE	Vertical prosecution and Special Probation Caseload
Solano	Solano County Narcotic Enforcement Task Force (Sol-NET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(7), County Substance Abuse Coordinator, CHP, BNE	Mid-level and major-level drug offenders	Task Force Commander - BNE	Vertical prosecution, co-location of team members (law enforcement and prosecution), and intensive probation supervision with a Recovery Treatment Program
Sonoma	Narcotics Elimination Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(9), Sonoma State University and Santa Rosa Junior College Police, Alcohol, Tobacco and Drug Services, DEA	Eliminate illicit trafficking and manufacturing of narcotics	Sheriff	Vertical prosecution
Stanislaus	Stanislaus Anti-Drug Task Force	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(7), Drug Enforcement Agency, Judge	Suppression of drug trafficking	Sheriff	Co-location of team members (law enforcement, prosecutor and probation)
Sutter	Anti-Drug Abuse Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Dept., NET-5 Advisory Council Judge,	Street and mid-level drug offenders	District Attorney	Coordination with NET-5
Tehama	Tehama and Glenn Methamphetamine Enforcement Team	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(4), CHP from both counties, BNE	Street, mid-level and major meth trafficking dealers or organizations	Task Force Commander - BNE	Two county program, prevention and education
Trinity	Trinity Anti-Drug Enforcement Program	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Behavioral Health Services, Bureau of Land Management	Suppression of illegal drug abuse	District Attorney	Probation drug specialist to monitor targeted offenders

County	Title	Participating Agencies	Focus of MJTF	Lead Agency / Project Director	Key Program Characteristic(s)
Tulare	Interagency Narcotics Enforcement Team (INET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(8), County Drug Admin.	Impact existing narcotics distribution	Sheriff	Multi-agency coordination
Tuolumne	Tuolumne Narcotic Team (TNT)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Child Welfare Services, General Hospital	Street and mid-level drug traffickers	District Attorney	Drug endangered children (protect children from dangerous drugs and toxic chemicals present at drug homes and meth labs)
Ventura	Ventura County Combined Agency Team (VCAT)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(5), County Alcohol and Drug Program, DEA	Drug interdiction, disruption of major and mid-level drug distribution networks, and the targeting of high-level drug trafficking enterprises or money laundering	Sheriff	Base of operations for the task force shall be in a confidential location and use of surveillance aircraft
Yolo	Yolo County Narcotics Enforcement Team (YONET)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(4), University of California at Davis Police, BNE, CHP	Illegal drugs	District Attorney	Vertical prosecution
Yuba	Yuba County Drug Impact Program (YDIP)	Sheriff, DA, Probation, Police Depts.(2), County Drug Administrator	Street, mid-level, and major drug offenders	Probation	Focus on probation services and activities

Source: Multi-Jurisdictional Drug Task Force operational agreements and memoranda of understanding as provided by OCJP were reviewed. Incomplete data and/or lack of clarity may contribute to researchers making judgment regarding response categories.

APPENDIX 3: MJTF Evaluation 2003 - Coding Instructions for Data Entry Form

<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
MJTF Name	Should correspond with project title; cross-check with Master List of MJTFs; use name from Master List of MJTFs if any discrepancy exists
County	Should have an indication by address (e.g., city); may also be written on another page of the status/progress report; also...see manila file folder
Grant Period	Circle appropriate year(s) on data entry form
Report Period	Circle appropriate year(s) on data entry form
Report Type	Circle either Final (2 nd Status Report) or Extension; for a two-year grant period, the final report covers the 5 th -8 th quarters
Total Grant Award	Enter dollar amount from the Budget section on the first page
Grant Balance	Enter dollar amount from the Budget section ('Total Grant balance') on the first page of the status/progress report

Searches and Investigations

Search Warrants (Projected)	Enter the projected number of search warrants as indicated in the status report
Search Warrants (Actual)	Enter the total number of search warrants as indicated in the status report; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters

Variable/QuestionInstructions

Investigations (Projected)

Enter the projected number of investigations initiated by the task force

Investigations (Actual)

Enter the total number of investigations initiated by the task force in a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5th through 8th quarters*Arrest Information*

Arrests (Projected)

Enter the projected number of arrests

Arrests (Actual)

Enter the total number of arrests for a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5th through 8th quarters

Prosecutions (Projected)

Enter the projected number of prosecutions

Prosecutions (Actual)

Enter the total number of prosecutions for a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5th through 8th quarters

Convictions (Projected)

Enter the projected number of convictions

Convictions (Actual)

Enter the total number of convictions for a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5th through 8th quarters*Seizures, Dismantling, and Eradications*

Weapons Seized (Projected)

Enter the projected number of weapons to be seized

<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
Weapons Seized (Actual)	Enter the total number of weapons seized during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Drug Labs Dismantled (Projected)	Enter the projected number of drug labs to be dismantled in a given year
Drug Labs Dismantled (Actual)	Enter the total number of drug labs that were dismantled during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Marijuana Areas Eradicated (Projected)	Enter the projected number of marijuana areas to be eradicated in a given year
Marijuana Areas Eradicated (Actual)	Enter the total number of marijuana areas that were eradicated during a given year

Illegal Drugs Seized

Methamphetamine (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of methamphetamine to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Methamphetamine (Actual)	Enter the total amount of methamphetamine seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)

<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
Heroin (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of heroin to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Heroin (Actual)	Enter the total amount of heroin seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Cocaine (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of cocaine to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Cocaine (Actual)	Enter the total amount of cocaine seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Marijuana (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of marijuana to be seized (number only)

Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
Marijuana (Actual)	Enter the total amount of marijuana seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Marijuana Plants (Projected)	Enter the projected number of marijuana plants to be seized in a given year
Marijuana Plants (Actual)	Enter the total number of marijuana plants seized during a given year
Hash (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of hash to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Hash (Actual)	Enter the total amount of hash seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
GHB (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of GHB to be seized (number only)

<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
GHB (Actual)	Enter the total amount of GHB seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Mushrooms (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of mushrooms to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Mushrooms (Actual)	Enter the total amount of mushrooms seized in a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
LSD (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of LSD to be

	seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
LSD (Actual)	Enter the total amount of LSD seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Ecstasy (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of ecstasy to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Ecstasy (Actual)	Enter the total amount of ecstasy seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Other Drugs (Projected)	Enter the projected amount of other drugs to be seized (number only)
Measure (Projected)	Enter the measurement for the projected

	amount of this drug to be seized in a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
Other Drugs (Actual)	Enter the total amount of other drugs seized during a given year (number only); if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters

Variable/Question

Instructions

Measure (Actual)	Enter the measurement for the total amount of this drug seized during a given year (e.g., grams, pounds, kilos, pills/tabs/hits, etc.)
------------------	--

Asset Seizures

Assets Seized \$ (Projected)	Enter the projected dollar amount for assets seized in a given year
Assets Seized \$ (Actual)	Enter the total dollar amount of assets seized during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Assets Seized (Number) (Projected)	Enter the projected number of assets to be seized in a given year
Assets Seized (Number) (Actual)	Enter the total number of assets seized during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters

Probation

Probation Searches (Projected)	Enter the projected number of probation searches in a given year
Probation Searches (Actual)	Enter the total number of probation searches

	during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
Probation Revocations (Projected)	Enter the projected number of probation revocations in a given year
Probation Revocations (Actual)	Enter the total number of probation revocations during a given year; if the grant period is two years, enter the total for the 5 th through 8 th quarters
<u>Variable/Question</u>	<u>Instructions</u>
<i>Other Data</i>	
Training Sessions	Enter the number of training sessions attended by task force members
Number in Attendance	Enter the number of task force members attending this training
Presentations	Enter the number of presentations given by task force members
Number in Attendance	Enter the number of task force members giving the presentation (make note if some other number—e.g., number of community groups attending presentation—is available)
Meetings	Enter the number of meetings attended by task force members
Individuals Sentenced to Prison	Enter the number of individuals sentenced to prison
Number of Vertical Prosecution Cases Initiated	Enter the number of vertical prosecution cases initiated by the DA/task force
Number of Cases Involving Child Protective	Enter the number of cases involving CPS or

Services (CPS) or Drug Endangered
Children (DEC)

DEC programs

APPENDIX 4: MJTF Interview Schedule

Script

Hello. My name is _____ and this is _____ (student notetaker). We're part of the CSUS Evaluation Team working with John Isaacson from the Office of Criminal Justice Planning (OCJP). I'd like to ask you some questions about the Byrne-funded Multi-Jurisdictional Task Force in your county to help us get a better understanding about what works or what may not work so well. The information that you provide will be combined with other information that we gather and it will be reported in aggregate form—in other words, we are not going to attach a name or a specific county to the information that we discuss in the report. Do you have any questions before we get started?

Code background information:

County: _____

Task Force Component:

Check one:

- _____ Law Enforcement
_____ Probation
_____ Prosecution
_____ Other _____
(Specify)

I'd like to start by asking you some general questions about the task force.

- How long has the task force been in operation? _____ mos./yrs.
- How many individuals currently serve on the task force?
Commanders _____ Investigators _____

Clerical/Support	_____	Probation	_____
Prosecution	_____	Other (Specify)	_____

- Describe how the task force operates in your county.

General Questions

- 1) What are three key features of your task force that you believe contribute to effective cooperation and coordination? (e.g., processing all asset forfeitures for county, assignment of deputy DA, only drug task force in county, co-location)

#1

#2

#3

- 2) Are there any other features or practices that you believe are also significant?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 3**)

_____ yes

If yes, please describe.

- 3) Are the task force priorities and focus appropriate to the drug problem in this county? (Are you doing what really needs to be done?)

- 4) If the drug task force ceased to exist tomorrow, what would happen to drug enforcement in the county?

- 5) Are there other drug task forces that operate in your jurisdiction?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 6**)

_____ yes

If yes, how do you interact and/or work with these task forces?

- 6) Do you as a task force member participate in regularly scheduled meetings?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 7**)

_____ yes

If yes, how often and with whom?

What is gained from these meetings?

7) Do you participate in joint training with other members of the task force?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 8**)

_____ yes

If yes, describe type, participants, and frequency.

8) What are some of the unintended consequences of your task force activities? (e.g, provide a trained surveillance unit to other agencies that would not have otherwise been available).

9) What challenges hinder your ability to reach higher levels of effectiveness?

10) If you were to advise another county who is setting up a drug task force, what have you learned that you would share with them?

Task Force Commanders

1) What role do you play in the selection and hiring of new task force members?

2) Do you have any problems with frequent turnover in task force staffing?

3) Does the steering committee periodically review the allocation of grant resources?

If **no**, do you believe it would be useful for the Steering Committee to consider this?

If **yes**, have they ever changed the allocation formula in response to changing needs or circumstances in your jurisdiction?

4) Are you consulted in the event of any allocation changes?

Steering Committee Members

1) Are you a member of the steering committee?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO SUPPLEMENTAL QUESTIONS**)

_____ yes (**IF YES, CONTINUE TO QUESTION 2**)

- 2) How often does your steering committee meet and what are the nature of their discussions?
- 3) Does the steering committee periodically review the allocation of grant resources? If yes, have you ever changed the allocation formula in response to changing needs or circumstances in your jurisdiction?

Law Enforcement

- 1) Is the nature of drug enforcement investigations changing?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 2**)

_____ yes

If yes, how and why?

- 2) The data indicate a drop in the number of investigations initiated between 1999 and 2002. Have you experienced this in your jurisdiction?

_____ no (**IF NO, SKIP TO QUESTION 3**)

_____ yes

If yes, please explain.

- 3) The data also showed a decrease in the number of meth labs dismantled. Can you explain that finding for us?

- 4) How do you handle deconfliction?

- 5) Do task force members have access to each other's databases?

_____ no (**IF NO, PROCEED TO FOLLOW-UP QUESTION**)

_____ yes (**IF YES, END INTERVIEW**)

If *not*, how do you access information regarding potential suspects?

Prosecution

What practices or procedures facilitate successful prosecution and conviction of MJTF cases?

If not covered in Question 1, do you review all search warrants and complaints prior to judicial review?

_____ no (**IF NO, PROCEED TO FOLLOW-UP QUESTION**)

_____ yes

If no, what proportion of search warrants and/or complaints do you review prior to judicial review?

Has judicial practice changed in your jurisdiction between 1999 and 2002 in terms of the imposition of prison sentences for drug convictions?

_____ no (IF NO, END INTERVIEW)

_____ yes

If yes, how has it changed?

Probation

- 1) What proportion of your time is spent on task force activities?
- 2) Describe the role and or kind of assistance you provide to the task force.
- 3) What are the advantages and disadvantages of the way you participate on the task force?

Advantages

Disadvantages

- 4) Have there been any legal (statutory or case law) and/or departmental changes in policies and procedures regarding probation revocations between 1999 and 2002?

_____ no (**IF NO, END INTERVIEW**)

_____ yes

If yes, please describe these changes.

Other Task Force Participants

- 1) What proportion of your time is spent on task force activities?
- 2) Describe the role and or kind of assistance you provide to the task force.

- 3) What are the advantages and disadvantages of the way you participate on the task force?

Advantages

Disadvantages

APPENDIX 5: Consensus on Critical Elements for Success for Multi-Jurisdictional Task Forces

The Bureau of Justice Assistance (BJA) compiled and reviewed all existing assessment and evaluation reports from BJA's Discretionary and Formula Programs. The result of this systematic search was the identification of critical elements that lead to successful accomplishment of both programmatic and organizational objectives of MJTFs. Findings included attention to both the establishment and implementation of multi-jurisdictional task forces. BJA's review identified an emerging consensus about what program elements and activities are essential to maintain successful (1) management and performance and (2) institutionalization and future sustainability. The "critical elements" presented in this appendix detail 12 characteristics of MJTFs that have been confirmed across a number of task forces to explain what works.

Critical Element 1: Written inter-agency agreements agreed to by all participating agencies establish broad objectives and funding methods for the task force. Well thought out written agreements can minimize future questions over activities and responsibilities and serve as a strong statement of the task forces' intention to set aside turf issues and work as a unit for the benefit of all agencies. A supportive feature of many successful task forces is the establishment of an **advisory board or group** to guide the decision making and oversight processes. This "board of directors can play a number of critical roles, including policy development, support for long term funding and coordination with external responsible officials and other agencies.

Critical Element 2: Prosecutor involvement, either as the "lead agency" or as a direct member and participant on task forces is common and has improved (1) task force ability to process cases and evidence, (2) enhance planning and tactics used in pursuing cases, and (3) linking law enforcement to other components of the criminal justice system.

Critical Element 3: Computerized information/intelligence databases and systems have gained increasing sophistication in the agencies involved in task forces. The development and maintenance of intelligence networks has become a key component in the task force maturation process, which also results in establishing capabilities in the individual participating agencies that few could have managed on their own. Enhanced investigative capabilities have led to expansion of task force objectives and activities to include financial investigations and RICO activities. Importantly, these networks often result in agencies avoiding duplication of investigative efforts.

Critical Element 4: Target decision, case planning and selection, and enhanced investigation tactics are now based on clear, specific criteria that focus on the procedures used among task force members. Initially task force participants agree upon and describe offenses and offenders targeted for priority apprehension. Participants all work together as a team when deciding on tactics to be used, both investigative and prosecutorial. This also leads to an enhanced ability to explain and coordinate task force agencies with other agencies.

Critical Element 5: Communication among task force participants, with their sponsoring agencies, other responsible officials, and other components of the criminal justice system is critical to the sustenance of the task force. Task forces should never become isolated or outside the reach and direction of their home agencies. Consistent, open channels for communication are critical to their acceptance and support externally, and meeting their

objectives internally. Many states are using the framework of statewide cluster meetings for all task forces to share information on improvements and modifications that produce more effective results. **Frequent, regular meetings** help keep task force officers focused on overall direction and program goals and objectives. By building relationships between agencies, the meetings minimize organizational problems. These meetings promote improvements through individual feedback to the group and reinforce roles of various participants. These are typically weekly or more frequent meetings to review current cases, planned arrests or surveillance projects, or other developments. An unanticipated result of communication concerning task forces activities has resulted in better overall communication between agencies.

Critical Element 6: Coordination of task force activities often determines the long term acceptance, and hence viability of the task force itself. Many studies have produced innovative means to promote coordination given the objectives and activities involved. Larger, urban task forces are more complex and must put in place multiple forms of coordination. Specialized task forces (gangs, border crimes, rural) often rely on coordination to gain resources on an as needed basis that are critical to the success of their operations. Many task forces now hold meetings, at least on a monthly basis, with all local, state, and federal entities operating within its jurisdiction.

Critical Element 7: Establishing the basis for a task force's **budget** is the central feature of interagency agreement, as well as building a consensus to support the cost of operations across the jurisdictions involved, including any federal funding that may be included. Reliable, long-term funding sources are crucial to task force permanence, and if found often indicate that a task force has institutionalized itself. **Funding** must be considered to match the needs and complexity that most task force operations require to meet their objectives. The availability of high technology equipment and computerized systems has created ever-increasing pressures to find funding that goes beyond the salaries and benefits of task force participants. Training costs, the need for external expertise, and use of overtime during periods of surveillance all make it difficult for task forces to stabilize resources. **Long term funding allocations** would alleviate many of the funding issues, but too often task forces exist on a year-to-year basis.

Critical Element 8: Clearly formulated **goals, objectives, and performance measures** are often a challenge to develop in the creation of a task force, but it is the most critical step to achieve for the future. When achieved, task forces gain specificity as to what is to be accomplished, with objectives that are both measurable and observable. Numerous examples of task forces objectives and performance measures exist today, making this exercise much less difficult. This also creates opportunities to compare results across task forces. For task forces, at the time they apply for continuing funding from outside or within their jurisdictions, the results of assessments and evaluations become critical and often determine if they will receive support.

Critical Element 9: Monitoring and evaluation should be consistent throughout the implementation of task forces. This is a key to revising task force goals, targets, procedures, and related activities. Strong management practices, including evaluation, lead to the long term institutionalization of task forces within their environment. This, in turn, often leads to changes in their objectives and adoption of tactics, but still underlies their acceptability and ability to serve unique and essential functions.

Critical Element 10: Staffing and recruitment begins with the recognized need for experienced leadership and supervision. Recruitment by supervisors seeks seasoned officers to work for them, but usually included younger, less experienced officers or even prosecutors

that need to be trained. Most task forces set limits on the length of time individuals, including supervisors, can participate in a specific task force. Individual agencies often profit greatly when task force members return to use their skills in their home agencies. Numerous task forces depend on part-time members, working when needed for special duties or on overtime from their regular positions. The flexibility required when faced with limited, experienced resources explains both the success and fragile nature of some task force configurations.

Critical Element 11: Effective asset seizure and forfeiture activities are not critical for all task forces because of the differences in constraints and applicability in different jurisdictions. In general, however, offenders' forfeiture of assets seized in drug arrests have benefits for task forces both as a practical enforcement tactic and as a means of ensuring financial viability of the task force.

Critical Element 12: The development and implementation of technical assistance and training programs that draw on the experiences of current and former task force participants is critical to the maintenance and continuity of task force operation. Federal funds often make the training of personnel possible. Such training may be replaced in the future because of the existing guidance and manuals, as well as the success of train-the-trainer programs providing cost effective opportunities for training and local levels. The success of many task forces relies on the supervisory experience and sufficient expertise to accomplish objectives. Effective training programs are critical to ensure personnel at all levels are properly trained as the foundation upon which task force successes are built.

APPENDIX 6: Chart 2: Major MJTF Recommendations Based on Focus Group Meetings, Progress Report Data and On-Site Interviews

RECOMMENDATION	EXPLANATION
MJTF POLICY AND PROCEDURES MANUAL	<p>PROVIDE ONE DOCUMENT THAT STATES THE TASK FORCE MISSION STATEMENT</p> <p>CONTAIN INFORMATION THAT RELATES TO EMPLOYEE CONDUCT, ADMINISTRATIVE PROCEDURES, OFFICE PROCEDURES, INJURY ON DUTY, FIELD ENFORCEMENT OPERATIONS, FIREARMS, EVIDENCE, CONFIDENTIAL SOURCE PROCEDURES, INVESTIGATIVE FUNDS, EQUIPMENT, VEHICLES, REPORT WRITING, AND ASSET FORFEITURES</p>
CO-LOCATION OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS	<p>FACILITATE SHARING OF INFORMATION AND EFFICIENCY OF RESPONSE TO TARGETS</p> <p>ALLOW FOR JOINTLY-INVESTIGATED CASES WITH TASK FORCE MEMBERS AND OTHER INVOLVED AGENCIES</p> <p>MAKE IT EASIER FOR DISTRICT ATTORNEY REPRESENTATIVE TO TRAIN LAW ENFORCEMENT AND PROBATION REPRESENTATIVES ON ARREST AND SEARCH PROCEDURES, AND WRITING OF WARRANTS</p>
MJTF TEAM INVOLVEMENT IN TASK FORCE MEMBER SELECTION	<p>INVOLVE REPRESENTATIVE(S) OF CURRENT TASK FORCE IN THE SELECTION OF NEW TEAM MEMBERS</p> <p>ESTABLISH SELECTION QUALIFICATIONS THAT INCLUDE EXPERIENCE WITH NARCOTICS ENFORCEMENT AND INVESTIGATION</p> <p>ENSURE REPRESENTATION FROM LAW ENFORCEMENT, PROSECUTION AND PROBATION</p> <p>IF MOVING LOCATIONS WITHIN JURISDICTION, ASSIGN ADDITIONAL MEMBERS FROM LOCAL AGENCY IN ORDER TO HAVE FAMILIARITY WITH LOCAL CUSTOM, POLICIES, AND PROCEDURES</p> <p>ENSURE COMMITMENT OF NEW TASK FORCE MEMBER TO THE GOALS AND OBJECTIVES OF THE SPECIFIC TASK FORCE</p> <p>EVALUATE NEED FOR GENDER/ETHNIC STAFF CONFIGURATION THAT REFLECTS DEMOGRAPHICS OF LOCAL JURISDICTION, INCLUDING MULTIPLE LANGUAGES</p>
PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICER ON MJTF	<p>ASSIGN PROBATION/PAROLE OFFICER FULL TIME TO THE TASK FORCE</p> <p>ALLOW FOR SMALL, SPECIALIZED PROBATION AND/OR PAROLE CASELOAD OF INDIVIDUALS TARGETED BY THE TASK FORCE, OR NO CASELOAD</p>
PROBATION AND PAROLE OFFICER ON MJTF (CONT.)	<p>PROVIDE PROBATION/PAROLE INFORMATION/INTELLIGENCE TO TASK FORCE MEMBERS</p> <p>MAINTAIN COMMUNICATION WITH</p>

A

	EFFECTIVE INVESTIGATIONS THAT RESULT IN THE ARREST, PROSECUTION AND CONVICTION OF DRUG TRAFFICKERS
FIELD TRAINING PROGRAM	<p>ASSIGN NEW TASK FORCE MEMBER TO FIELD TRAINING OFFICER (FTO)</p> <p>TRAINING INVOLVES ORIENTATION, OVERVIEW OF DRUG IDENTIFICATION, EVIDENCE HANDLING, LOCAL REPORT SYSTEM, WRITING OF SEARCH WARRANTS, FIELD AND TACTICAL OPERATIONS, AND OTHER LOCAL SPECIALIZED TASK FORCE PROGRAMS, ASSET FORFEITURE, CLANDESTINE LABS, AND PREPARATION FOR COURT</p> <p>STRENGTHEN NEW MEMBERS UNDERSTANDING OF POLICIES, PROCEDURES, LAWS, ETC., AND THOSE SKILLS THAT REQUIRE ACTUAL DEMONSTRATION SUCH AS CONDUCTING SURVEILLANCE, PREPARING REPORTS, EFFECTING AN ARREST, ETC.</p> <p>ENSURE SAFETY OF INDIVIDUAL AND OTHER TASK FORCE MEMBERS</p> <p>PLACE ULTIMATE RESPONSIBILITY FOR DEMONSTRATING UNDERSTANDING OF AND ABILITY TO PERFORM EACH PERFORMANCE OBJECTIVE WITH NEW MEMBER</p>
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MJTF MEETINGS	<p>FORMAL AND INFORMAL DEPENDING ON PHYSICAL LOCATION OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS</p> <p>ALLOW FOR SHARING OF INFORMATION (I.E., ONGOING COMMUNICATION)</p> <p>PROVIDE UPDATE ON EACH CASE FOR ALL TASK FORCE MEMBERS</p> <p>FACILITATE PREPARATION OF CASES AND FUTURE STEPS</p>
ONGOING TRAINING OF MJTF MEMBERS	<p>ESTABLISH TRAINING SCHEDULE THAT ADDRESSES STAFFING NEEDS</p> <p>ENCOURAGE TASK FORCE MEMBERS TO IDENTIFY TRAINING NEEDS</p> <p>ESTABLISH A 'MOBILE' TRAINING TEAM TO TRAIN ONE REPRESENTATIVE IN AN AGENCY WHO THEN TRAIN OTHER MEMBERS OF THE AGENCY</p> <p>ENHANCE QUALITY OF INVESTIGATIONS (E.G., STRENGTHEN ABILITY TO WRITE GOOD WARRANTS AND GATHER RELEVANT INFORMATION FOR PROSECUTION OF CASES)</p> <p>SOLID, VERIFIABLE, ONGOING, REALISTIC TRAINING (SVORT)</p>

MJTF COMPUTER TERMINAL	<p>PROVIDE COMPUTER TERMINAL TO MEMBERS OF TASK FORCE THAT HAS LINKS TO ALLIED AGENCIES AND DATA BASES</p> <p>IMPROVE INVESTIGATIVE EFFICIENCIES AND EFFECTIVENESS</p>
VERTICAL PROSECUTION	<p>ALLOW DISTRICT ATTORNEY ASSIGNED TO TASK FORCE TO GUIDE INVESTIGATIONS THROUGH TRAINING, AND REVIEW OF SEARCH AND ARREST WARRANTS</p> <p>STRENGTHEN ABILITY OF TASK FORCE MEMBERS TO PUT TOGETHER STRONG CASES THAT WILL EASE PROSECUTION</p> <p>WHERE APPLICABLE, WORK WITH TASK FORCE MEMBERS ON CIVIL AND CRIMINAL ABATEMENT ISSUES</p>
STANDARDIZED PROGRESS REPORT FORM	<p>IDENTIFY REQUIRED DATA (E.G., INVESTIGATIONS, ARRESTS) FOR ALL MJTFs</p> <p>ENSURE COMMON TERMINOLOGY AND DATA ELEMENTS FOR PROGRESS REPORTS</p> <p>INCLUDE SECTION FOR TASK FORCE DESCRIPTION OF UNIQUE FEATURES AND ACTIVITIES, AND TO REPORT MORE QUALITATIVE PROGRESS TOWARD ACHIEVING TASK FORCE GOALS</p> <p>ALLOW FOR ELECTRONIC FILING</p> <p>FACILITATE STATEWIDE EVALUATION OF TASK FORCES AND IMPROVE CROSS-COMPARISONS</p>
ANNUAL REVIEW OF BUDGET ALLOCATION	<p>BUILD INFLATION FACTOR INTO BUDGET SO THAT THE SAME LEVEL OF SERVICE CAN BE MAINTAINED EACH YEAR</p> <p>REVIEW FEDERAL, STATE AND LOCAL SHARE OF BUDGET TO IDENTIFY SOURCES OF NEW FUNDING</p>
MAINTAIN CONTINUING AGENCY COMMITMENT TO MJTF	<p>ENSURE CONTINUITY IN SERVICES</p> <p>CONTRIBUTE TO SUCCESS OF MJTF</p>